



20N Z1

-75V112



THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON VIOLENCE IN THE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

RESEARCH REPORT

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF FEATURE FILMS

by

James M. Linton
Garth S. Jowett

The Center for Canadian Communication
Studies
University of Windsor

1976



PRE-PUBLICATION COPY

The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Royal Commission on Violence in the Communications Industry, whose conclusions will be presented in its Final Report.



A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF FEATURE FILMS

by

James M. Linton
Garth S. Jowett

The Center for Canadian Communication
Studies
University of Windsor

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON VIOLENCE
IN THE COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

The Honourable Judy LaMarsh
P.C., Q.C., LL.D., Chairman

His Honor Judge Lucien Beaulieu
Commissioner

Scott Young, Commissioner

* * * *

Anne Cameron
Director of Administration

Sheila Kieran
Director of Public Participation

C.K. Marchant
Director of Research

* * * *

151 Bloor Street West, Room 810
Toronto, Ontario M5S 2V5

Telephone (416) 965-4593.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

James M. Linton

Garth S. Jowett

RESEARCH ASSISTANT

Ruth Armour

RESEARCH AND STENOGRAPHY

Doreen Truant

December, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I	
A BRIEF SURVEY OF MOTION PICTURE CONTENT RESEARCH	1
A. Historical Overview of Movie Content .	1
B. Movie Content and Its Effects.	12
C. Selected Studies of Film Content . . .	15
1. Edgar Dale's "The Content of Motion Pictures" (1933).	15
2. Dorothy Jones' Content Analyses. .	19
3. The War Film	22
4. The Warner Bros. Study	23
5. The Wolfenstein and Leites Study .	24
6. The New Zealand Study.	25
D. The State of Motion Picture Content Analysis	26
CHAPTER II	
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FILMS	34
A. All Films.	34
1. General Characteristics.	34
2. Tone	40
3. Global Messages.	41
4. Portrayal of Groups.	44
5. Conflict and Non-Conflict Incidents.	47
6. Ratings and Incidence of Violence.	50
B. Comparison of Canadian and Non-Canadian Films	51
1. Tone	51
2. Global Messages.	52
3. Portrayal of Groups.	56
4. Conflict and Non-Conflict Incidents.	60
5. Ratings and Incidence of Violence.	62
C. Comparison of Popular and Not-So-Popular Films	64
1. Tone	64
2. Global Messages.	65
3. Portrayal of Groups.	68
4. Conflict and Non-Conflict Incidents.	72
5. Ratings and Incidence of Violence.	75

	<u>Page</u>
D. Comparison of Action and Non-Action Films	77
1. Tone	77
2. Global Messages	79
3. Portrayal of Groups	82
4. Conflict and Non-Conflict Incidents	86
5. Ratings and Incidence of Violence	89
E. Summary	91
CHAPTER III CHARACTERS AND RELATIONSHIPS.	97
A. Characters.	97
1. General Characteristics for All Characters.	97
2. Comparison of Leading and Non-Leading Characters.	106
3. Comparison of Males and Females	114
4. Comparison of Protagonists, Antagonists and "Mixed" Role Types	120
5. Comparison of the Sexes for Leading and Non-Leading Characters.	127
6. Comparison of Tole Types for Leading and Non-Leading Characters.	133
7. Comparison of Characters for Production Sources, Popularity Levels and Film Types	141
8. Traits Scores	154
a) All Characters.	154
b) Leading and Non-Leading Characters.	157
c) Male and Female Characters.	160
d) Protagonists and Antagonists.	163
9. The Character Structure of Characters.	166
a) All Characters.	166
b) Males and Females	168
c) Protagonists, Antagonists and "Mixed" Role Types.	171
B. Relationships	176
1. The Nature of Relationships for All Films	176
2. Relationships in Canadian and Non-Canadian Films.	180
3. Relationships in Popular and Not-So-Popular Films.	183

	<u>Page</u>
4. Relationships in Action and Non-Action Films	186
C. Summary.	189
CHAPTER IV INCIDENTS.	197
A. All Incidents.	197
1. General Presentation	197
2. The Settings	202
B. Means and Ends in Conflict Incidents .	208
C. Violent Conflict and Irrational Violence	217
1. The Scenario of "Violence"	217
a) The Parties to the Violence. .	217
b) Other Parties on the Scene . .	220
c) Contextual Elements.	223
d) Mode of Violence	223
e) The Consequences of Violence .	223
2. Differences Between Violent Conflict and Irrational Violence .	230
D. Other Incidents.	237
1. Arguments.	237
2. Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflicts	240
3. Verbal Abuse	241
4. Harm to Self	243
5. Destruction of Property.	246
6. Theft.	246
E. Summary.	249
CHAPTER V THE STYLISTIC TREATMENT OF VIOLENCE. . . .	260
A. The Study of Visual Style or Form in Film.	260
B. A Statistical Study of the Visual Style of Violence.	263
C. Possible "Meanings" of the Stylistic Treatment of Violence.	272
CHAPTER VI POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF FEATURE FILM CONTENT .	280
A. A Model or Theory of the Film Viewing Experience	280
B. The Audience and the Sociology of Filmviewing	288
C. Film and the Range of Its "Effects". .	293
1. Catharsis Versus Arousal/Aggression	293
2. Desensitization.	296

	<u>Page</u>
3. Imitation	296
4. Violence Succeeds	297
5. Images of "Reality"	299
a) Stereotypes	299
b) Perceptions of a Violent Environment	300
c) Victimization and Observation of Violence	301
APPENDIX A THE METHOD OF SELECTING THE SAMPLE.	308
1. Delineation of the Population(s).	308
2. Stratifying and Weighting the Sample(s)	310
3. Unavailability of Films	314
APPENDIX B THE METHODOLOGY OF CONTENT ANALYSIS AS EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY.	321
1. Development of the Recording (Coding) Instrument	321
2. Selection and Training of Coders.	323
3. Analysis Procedures	325
4. Determining Reliability	326

. . . add that the motion picture is peculiarly adapted to all the conditions of the society in which it occurs, that it is an art which almost perfectly reflects the needs of an industrial democracy for communication and social education . . . as well as for effective recreation, and it will be seen that the problem of the movies is amazingly difficult, both for those who try to produce them either for the sake of art or profit, and for those who, seeking the common good and the increase of human happiness, are forced to weigh the balance of their clear positive values and great utility against whatever injurious effects they claim to find and wish to eliminate by reform.

Mortimer Adler, Art and Prudence
(1937)

CHAPTER I

A BRIEF SURVEY OF MOTION PICTURE CONTENT RESEARCH

A. Historical Overview of Movie Content

It was not long after their introduction in the 1890's that the movies found themselves under investigation; for this new entertainment represented a social and cultural force, the likes of which had not been seen before in modern society. The speed of its dissemination, and the enormous audiences which were immediately attracted to the increasing number of "dream palaces" represented for many a serious threat to late Victorian society's supposedly stable social structure.¹ Before the "threat" could be countered, those who were concerned with the influence of this new entertainment attempted to discover something about its form—its role in the recreational pursuits of the working class, the nature and composition of the audience, and the themes most often used to attract audiences. While the first two areas were conscientiously pursued, and a myriad of studies relating to health, effects on children, types of audiences and moral questions were undertaken, the area of motion picture content received little systematic attention beyond crude categorization into supposedly dominant segments such as "love," "crime," or "adventure."

The failure to adequately examine the use of common themes in early motion pictures can be accounted for in several ways. First, the major interest in the entertainment centred

on its supposed ability to "influence" (as well as to entertain), and thus only those films which appeared to contribute to antisocial behaviour received much attention. Second, no-one seriously considered that the motion picture could be a force for good, until well after the first censorship travails in 1907. By 1912, however, social workers and others were beginning to extoll the virtues of the movies as a means of combatting the evils of alcoholism and other urban vices.² Lastly, it was not until the late 1920's that anyone seriously suggested that we could learn something about a society by examining the material aspects of its culture, such as the movies, and this eventually resulted in several seminal research undertakings into motion picture content.

Despite the failure to examine the nature of early movie content in its current setting, modern scholars have been able to trace a direct link between this content and certain social tensions evident at the time. Film historian Lewis Jacobs has noted of this period:

The Americans rarely left their own backyards and streets even when they were technically able to do so. Fairy tales, fantasies, storybook romances, were far removed from their immediate interests. Subject matter was derived from American life—from the exploits of the policeman and burglar, cowboy and factory worker, farmer and country girl, clerk and politician, drunkard and servant girl, store keeper and mechanic.³

Film critic and historian Alexander Walker has suggested that there were valid social reasons for the popularity of much of the "morbid" content then evident in these early films:

It is worth emphasizing that the sentimentality of the plots, which jars today, was then very much a fact of life for nickelodeon audiences from the backstreets or immigrant ghettos where drunkenness bred brutish parents, long-lost off-spring were the common price of having to leave one's homeland, and the dying babies of melodrama had their statistical reality in the infant mortality rate.⁴

It was precisely this type of content which seemed to disturb the growing number of critics who saw a danger in the increasing popularity of this new form of entertainment. Typical of these responses was an article published in the Review of Reviews by an anonymous critic in 1908:

One's regret for such exhibitions is deepened by the reflection that just as much time and effort have been spent in preparing the films for these pictures, as would have been in producing others of a more desirable character . . . And all the thought, time and energy have been expended for the portrayal of the realism of bloodshed, crime and brutality.

There are, of course, many exhibitions in the moving picture that give praiseworthy entertainments; but there are very more that pander to low passions and have nothing but the film that will draw the biggest crowd without actually pulling the [movie] house into the policecourt.⁵

After 1908, the content of films appeared to move away from these concerns, and as the size of the middle-class audience increased, the movies expanded their range of interests. Now one could find more plots featuring American history, the early West and more pretentious literary works and morality dramas. The film still, however, represented a means of escapism for its audiences, and it was this kind of escapist material that was to emerge as the single most popular form. As the financial investment grew, the film industry concentrated increasingly on those content forms which were the most acceptable to the general audience. This in turn led to a concept of the formula plot; a series of dramatic conventions that would dictate the quality of motion pictures up to the present day.

By the 1920's the influence of the middle-class audience was dominant, and the subject matter of films was broadened and the selection and manipulation of material became more

purposeful and self-conscious as "the morality of the nineties was being transformed into the new progressivism."⁶ The increasing sophistication of this new audience, more used to the broader and relevant themes of popular novels or even the live stage, necessitated a profound change in film content if their interest was to be maintained. The preaching and obvious morality of the movies became less pronounced, and films no longer told the workingman of his problems, but instead attempted to divert his attention and sought to entertain him by showing the world of the more fortunate. The combination of this new audience, and the arrival of the First World War pushed the motion picture toward a greater sophistication, and the "moralism and religiousness" of the prewar period was transformed into the more sophisticated fare offered to postwar audiences.

Throughout the twenties the motion picture industry consolidated itself, and strengthened its hold on a now worldwide public. Jacobs has noted that the industry, "like the Supreme Court, followed the election returns. They took up the cause of business, grew cynical, and participated in the repudiation of a pre-war conventionality."⁷ While the old values and sentiments were not entirely swept away, they nevertheless took on a more materialistic viewpoint that was also decidedly feminine in character, and which seemed to "be in equal part due to the effect of female emancipation and of defensive male reaction to it."⁸ The importance of women as leading and strong characters in these films has often been noted by film historians, and there is little doubt that the film industry had discovered the box office appeal of sophisti-

cated "sex."

By the end of the decade the Depression had made itself felt even in the seemingly impregnable film industry. The economic plight, together with the technical development of sound films, combined to force the studios into more aggressive competition for the shrinking box office dollar. As a result, the public were inundated with a series of films with provocative titles such as Why Change Your Wife?; Forbidden Fruit; or Why Women Sin. After 1930, the addition of sound added immensely to the popularity of gangster films such as Little Caesar, Public Enemy and Scarface.

In an address delivered in October, 1933, Mary G. Hawks, the retiring president of the National Council of Catholic Women, evaluated the current motion picture situation in these terms:

Public consciousness is now aroused to the fact that the movies as they are produced and distributed today, are a menace to the physical, mental and moral welfare of the nation . . . These injurious effects are greatly enhanced by the shameless sex appeal of the advertising. . . . We must face the unpleasant fact that constant exposure to screen stories of successful gangsters and "slick" racketeers, of flaming passion and high power emotionalism, may easily nullify every standard of life and conduct set up at home and at school and will almost inevitably effect a moral decline . . .⁹

It was against this background that the movies were subjected to the intense pressure of the Catholic Legion of Decency, and the new-found strength of the Production Code Administration of the Hays Office. It was also in this "moral" climate that several important analyses of movie content and "influence" were conducted. Little wonder then that by the mid-thirties, content analysis studies were mainly aimed at finding out the quantitative aspects of these supposedly recurrent themes,

and almost no attempt was made to evaluate content within the context of the entire dramatic presentation. It is unfortunate, but this perception has continued to cloud film content analyses up until the present time.

During the thirties the motion picture had what many critics call its "golden age," when, under the strictures of the infamous Production Code, the Hollywood studios turned out a surprising number of excellent films. In spite of its basic dictum to entertain and not educate, the American film industry did manage to face many of the problems of the Depression in productions such as Our Daily Bread, I am a Fugitive from a Chain Gang, and The Grapes of Wrath, although these "social realism" efforts were in a minority. Far more numerous were frothy musicals, lighthearted "screwball" comedy, and romantic escapades. By 1939, Hollywood began to recognize the Nazi menace, and the first anti-Nazi films appeared, much to the chagrin of those who wished to see the United States remain totally neutral in the war.¹⁰

World War II provided the motion picture industry with some of its finest hours as it was called upon to contribute to the war effort by "clarifying, inspiring and entertaining." On the homefront, attendance at motion picture theatres reached an all-time high (as did profits), while the movies provided welcome relief and a strong link with home for fighting forces throughout the world. Despite what may seem obvious, not all the films made in Hollywood during the years 1941-1945 concerned the war. In fact, the important content analyses work of Dorothy Jones and Russel Shain have demonstrated that in no one year did war films ever constitute more than 33.2 per

cent of the total number of productions.¹¹ The majority of motion pictures continued to provide the staple forms of content their audiences had come to expect, a fact which Dorothy Jones did not approve of:

For years producers had been adamant in their opinion that what the American public wants, above all else, is to be entertained. It is small wonder, then, that faced with the task of making films which would educate the public about the war, most Hollywood movie makers did not know where to begin. They lacked experience in making films dealing with actual social problems. And, like the rest of America, they themselves lacked real understanding of the war.¹²

Despite many similar attacks on the performance of the motion picture industry during this crucial period, in the final analysis, the American (and British) motion picture did what was asked of it during World War II. It furthered the military effort by disseminating information about the war to the public; it helped to explain the enemy and his ideology; it emotionalized the public as no other medium was then capable of doing; it told the Allies what they were fighting for; and last, and most important, it continued to entertain millions of people. The therapeutic aspects of the cinema during these years should not be underestimated.

At the conclusion of the war, it was hoped by many of the industry's critics that the industry would be "revitalized" by its vivid war experiences, and that some form of amalgam would take place between the purely commercial product and the documentary film. Unfortunately, this was not to be, and faced almost immediately with the threat from the new entertainment medium—television—the motion picture industry went into a decline, from which it has never fully recovered. Nevertheless, the period 1946-1960 was a particularly rich period for

creativity in the American film, and these fifteen years witnessed important new directions in the American motion picture. While the concept of "Hollywood" still dominated the movie industry, the studio system was breaking down, and together with it, the Production Code and the reliance upon the old box office "formulae." This presented an ideal opportunity for the more adventurous film makers to explore themes and ideas which had not been examined before in the commercial film medium.

Thus in the period 1946-1950 a series of "message" films were produced in Hollywood, all examining facets of the American scene which had previously been considered unsuitable for motion picture fare. In movies such as The Best Years of Our Lives (1946), Boomerang (1947), Crossfire (1947), Gentlemen's Agreement (1948), Pinky (1949), and Knock on Any Door (1949), the themes of unemployment, corruption, anti-Semitism, racial prejudice and juvenile delinquency were examined in unprecedented detail for the usually reticent film industry. After 1950, the unfavourable climate caused by the tensions of the Cold War, and the resultant anti-Communist crusade led to a gradual decline in this type of controversial content, and the American film industry reverted to variations on the tried-and-true formulae as it desperately sought to counter the growing influence of television.

Despite the overwhelming conformity, by the mid-fifties domestic tensions had relaxed sufficiently to allow the production of such important "message" films as On The Waterfront (1954) which looked at union corruption; Rebel Without a Cause (1955), which dealt with juvenile delinquency; The Man with

the Golden Arm (1955) which treated the problems of drug addiction realistically; and The Defiant Ones (1958) which examined interracial relationships on a more intense plane than before.¹³ Also, mention should be made of the series of science-fiction films, popular during this period, which exposed the nagging fears of the possibility of atomic conflict.

By the 1960's there was a great deal of uncertainty in the American film industry, and it became difficult to predict, with any accuracy, what type of film would appeal to an audience which was getting younger, and also becoming more educated.¹⁴ Thus the success of the James Bond films (Dr. No, 1962; To Russia with Love, 1963; Goldfinger, 1964) inspired a succession of dismal spy-thrillers; and later in the early seventies, the unexpected appeal of oriental martial arts films created an enormous number of cheap imitations. In between these two fads, Hollywood went through a variety of cycles, forever searching for the key to the audience's interest. These included a slew of motorcycle gang "cheapies," which attracted their own cult audience, a constant stream of horror films, imported from the dungeons of Hammer Films in England, and an interesting series of "caper" films, in which the entire story centred around the attempt to engineer an improbable theft of some fabulous art treasure or mounds of gold bullion.

It was however, the increasing use of explicit sex and graphic violence which made the movies of the sixties and seventies different from those of previous decades. Starting casually (and somewhat innocently) with producer Russ Meyer's The Immoral Mr. Teas in 1959, by 1976 neighbourhood theatres in cities all across the United States were openly exhibiting

hard-core pornographic films in double-bill shows. The success of many of the sexploitation films encouraged the major studios to increase the amount of sexual frankness in their bigger-budgeted films.¹⁵ However, while the courts and local authorities were primarily concerned with sexual issues, the public seemed to be far more concerned with the violence in movies, which became increasingly more gory and realistic. Films such as Bonnie and Clyde, The Wild Bunch and Straw Dogs precipitated serious critical debates about the merits of depicting violence in such graphic terms on the screen.

The fact that motion pictures had not lost their power to influence an audience was dramatically illustrated by the release of The Exorcist in late 1973. This film, a mixture of sex, sadism and the occult, created an enormous public furore. Everywhere the film was shown there were reports of fainting and vomiting in theatres, but of greater significance was the reported increase in belief in the devil, demonic possession, and serious psychological disorders manifested by people who had seen the film. As expected, movie screens have subsequently experienced an unending procession of films dealing with the occult. Again, in the summer of 1975, the film Jaws created a "shark-mania" throughout the United States and Canada, proving to be the greatest box office attraction of all time. The success of Jaws launched the motion picture industry into a series of similar, if less impressive films, featuring killer bees, giant rampaging bears, lethal frogs and even dangerous worms.

The latest cycle to emerge in the mid-seventies was that of the disaster film. Starting with the surprisingly

successful The Poseidon Adventure in 1973, the industry has subsequently examined fires, earthquakes, tidal waves, crowd panics, and ecological disasters. Most of these films have proven to be successful money makers, and as a result, the unpredictable movie business reported that 1975 was the best in its entire history for gross box office receipts. (Much of this can, of course, be accounted for by increases in admission prices; nevertheless, total number of admissions were the highest since the early sixties.)

Where movie content will venture next is as uncertain as ever. As competition for the leisure dollar increases, the industry will be more and more hard-pressed to continually provide fare which will attract audiences. The swing away from permissive sexual tolerance evidenced by recent decisions in the U.S. courts, and the increasing clamour against violence may lead to new explorations of older themes. However, the only certain factor in film production at the moment is uncertainty.

It is also worthwhile noting that the fledgling and struggling Canadian film industry has also come under severe attack for its alleged concentration on sex and violence as guarantors of success. The Canadian Film Development Corporation (CFDC) was established in 1967 to "foster and promote the development of a feature film industry in Canada," and immediately ran into a conflict between culture and economics. On the one hand the CFDC acts as a bank, and is expected to invest only in films in which it believes there is a reasonable chance of making money. On the other hand, the agency reports not to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, but to

the Secretary of State. Thus its broad aims are supposed to be cultural rather than strictly economic. This incongruity had become more obvious as critics have attacked the CFDC for investing in sexploitation films, or those which concentrate on violence; nevertheless, many of these have been amongst the very few financially successful Canadian productions. The Canadian film industry is forced to compete with the Hollywood product domestically, and thus it is only natural to expect that it often chooses to do so with similar types of content which are proven box office attractions.

B. Movie Content and Its Effects

The relationship between the content of motion pictures and the role that such content plays in shaping the behaviour of the audience is not easily understood. While there have been many attempts to study this relationship, we still cannot explain with absolute certainty the nature of this relationship. Studies of film content which examine the relationship between the social and cultural ethos and the type of films produced by that society have been far more successful in establishing predictable patterns; but even here there have been disagreements in interpretation of the available evidence.¹⁶ It is quite clear that more systematic work on these relationships is much needed. As George Gerbner has said:

Mass production and distribution of message systems transforms selected private perspectives into broad public perspectives, and brings mass publics into existence . . .

The truly revolutionary significance of modern mass communication is its "public-making" ability. That is the ability to form historically new bases for collective thought and action quickly, continuously, and pervasively across previous boundaries of time, space, and culture . . .

We need to know what general terms of collective cultivation about existence, priorities, values, and relationships are given in collectively shared public message systems before we can reliably interpret facts of individual and social response.¹⁷

The motion picture, in particular, has been a potent "public message system" for more than seventy years. During this time it has established itself as both a reflection of the society around it, and also as a "leader" of new ideas in a society, although the "reflector" role is by far the more common one. The reasons for the popularity of the movies are obvious. They provide a vivid visual presentation in which the images are already fully established, easily identified (in most cases), and easily followed. While the complete psychological significance of the filmic presentation still defies analysis, it does seem clear that films are conducive to ready comprehension. This makes it easy for the spectator to assume the role of the characters and to identify with them quickly and effectively. If the aesthetic contributions of the "closeup" and "dramatic form" are added to the vividness of presentation, it is not difficult to explain why motion pictures are such an effective form of communication. In the final analysis, the avowed purpose of the producer of the film is to induce this absorption or identification on the part of the spectator; while to have this experience is the desire of the average movie-goer.

To satisfy this "experience" for the movie-goer, films have traditionally depended on appeals to primary emotions and sentiments. While this is inevitably true of all drama, in the movies these simplistic emotional appeals tend to become exaggerated. In the commercial cinema, in particular, little

use is made of abstract forms or of complicated and remote symbolism (at least at the conscious level, despite what some film scholars might say), but instead, there is an exploitation of what is primary and universal in human beings. Thus emotions, passions and sentiments are overemphasized. It is precisely because motion pictures deal with a mass of individuals with wide variations in educative and cultural backgrounds, that is on this elemental level that they find common responsiveness.¹⁸

Herbert Blumer, the noted social psychologist, in his perceptive analysis of motion picture influence has suggested their general influence is a "reaffirmation of basic human values but an undermining of the mores." He elaborates:

Since the appeal of motion pictures depends so much on touching primary sentiments, it is not strange that they should stress those human qualities which are man's universal possession. In the cinema, one finds the constant portrayal and approval of such qualities as bravery, loyalty, love, affection, frankness, personal justness, cleverness, heroism and friendship. . . .

However, the social patterns or schemes of conduct inside of which these primary human qualities are placed are likely to be somewhat new, strange, and unfamiliar This concern with the new, the strange, and the different, is not merely a direction of attention to the outside of local culture; it is an attack upon local culture This penetration of basic human values into new social forms constitutes one of the most interesting features of motion pictures. It explains why and how they undermine the prevailing patterns of local culture.¹⁹

The ability of the motion picture to transport an audience outside of its local cultural experience is a significant one, and accounts for much of the concern about "movie influence." From another point-of-view, while movies may alienate people from their own local experiences, they also prepare people for a wider cross-section of society as a whole. As Blumer

points out: "motion pictures not only bring new objects to the attention of people but, what is probably more important, they make what has been remote and vague, immediate and clear."²¹ In this manner the movies are most effective in creating and reinforcing stereotypes, for where initial familiarity is least, the depiction in a definitive and familiar way becomes the norm. It is for this reason that so much attention was paid to movie content and influence, particularly by racial or ethnic minorities who have constantly been the victims of "Hollywood versions."

Perhaps the last word on movie influence should be left, yet again, to Herbert Blumer, who, in his extensive study of "Movies and Conduct" noted:

It is insufficient to regard motion pictures simply as a fantasy world by participating in which an individual softens the ardor of his life and escapes its monotony and hardships, nor to justify their content and "unreality" on this basis. For to many the pictures are authentic portrayals of life, from which they draw patterns of behavior, stimulation to overt conduct, content for a vigorous life of imagination, and ideas of reality. They are not merely a device for surcease; they are a form of stimulation.²²

C. Selected Studies of Film Content

1. Edgar Dale's "The Content of Motion Pictures" (1933)

The first major study of all facets of movie content was undertaken by Edgar Dale, then at Ohio State University, as part of the Payne Fund Studies on "Motion Pictures and Youth," and was published in 1935.²³ This study was the first to systematically sample the content of American-produced films in any meaningful way, and still stands as the most complete study of this type. Analyses of three different intensities

were made. The most extensive analysis was that of the major film offerings for the years 1920, 1925, and 1930. Five hundred films from each of these years were analyzed in printed synopsis form and classified as to their major theme.

A further in-depth analysis was made of 115 films, which were viewed in their entirety, using three "observers" (coders) in order to obtain more detailed information as to what was actually taking place on the screen. The most intensive level of research was conducted on 40 films, for, as Dale noted:

We felt, further, that we needed a number of accounts which would present almost completely the entire range of content of a motion picture in the context of the narrative itself. To that end, we secured from the producers dialogue scripts and used them in our analysis of 40 motion pictures. The script contains all the dialogue and enough of the settings and action to give each bit of dialogue its proper chronological order.²⁴

The coders then viewed the film, taking elaborate notes on settings, content and changes from the prepared scripts.

In the analysis of the 1,500 films for "major theme," it was not surprising that Dale found that "crime," "sex," and "love" were the most common thematic explorations. However, he was careful to point out that these were definitions of major themes, and a "love" film may contain scenes of criminality. "Crime," in particular, occurred in a large number of films, and therefore the amount of crime for the three years examined is actually underrepresented in the data.

The data in Table I-1 is self-explanatory, but it is worthy of note that the triadic group of crime, sex and love as major themes constituted 81.6 per cent in 1920, 79.2 per cent in 1925, and 72 per cent in 1930. As Dale noted of these trends:

TABLE I-1

COMPARISON OF THE RESULTS OF THREE SAMPLINGS OF MOTION PICTURES

Number and per cent of pictures of each type as shown by samples of 500, 115 and 40.

<u>Type of Picture</u>	<u>500 Pictures Released in 1930^a</u>		<u>115 Pictures Analyzed^b</u>		<u>40 Pictures Analyzed in Detail</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per cent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per cent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Crime	137	27.4	27	23.5	9	22.5
Sex	75	15.0	18	15.6	8	20.0
Love	148	29.6	34	29.6	7	17.5
Mystery	24	4.8	4	3.5	3	7.5
War	19	3.8	4	3.5	3	7.5
Children	1	.2	1	.9	1	2.5
History	7	1.4	1	.9	1	2.5
Travel	9	1.8	2	1.7	1	2.5
Comedy	80	16.0	24	20.9	7	17.5
Social propaganda	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	500	100.0	115	100.0	40	100.0

^aFifty-two of the 115 pictures analyzed are included in this sample. These 500 pictures represent the total 1930 production.

^bThis sample includes the 40 pictures analyzed in detail.

Source: Edgar Dale, The Content of Motion Pictures, p. 8.

The fact that two fifths of the pictures are concerned with crime and sex indicate a belief that a purpose of the movies is to deal with life problems and their solution. Certainly these are two problems that are always with us. Are they sufficiently important to warrant the attention they are receiving? . . . Are there no social problems other than those of crime and sex which would lend themselves to dramatic treatment?²⁵

The Dale Study also examined the locales and settings of movies; the nature of the characters in films; the type of clothing worn by leading characters; the circumstances of meeting and lovemaking; the nature of sex, marriage and romantic love depicted; vulgarity; the use of liquor and tobacco; the goals of the leading characters; and most important for our purposes, crime in the movies. Much against the common belief, in the intensive analysis of the 40 films, the researchers could find only one plot where the hero, a criminal, was definitely shown as attractive to adults. Nevertheless, within the context of the films themselves, it was noted that:

movie criminals are not always shown as low, cowardly, weak-minded, and physically repulsive. The evidence suggests that no small proportion of the criminals are accomplished in some of the social graces, and many are well dressed. Not infrequently we see on the screen criminals who are courageous and who meet danger fearlessly.²⁶

Regarding the origin of criminals, "only rarely" in the 40 films was any attempt made to indicate "criminal patterns of behavior develop as a product of a long process of interaction between the individual and the successive social situations in which he lives."²⁷

In terms of the frequency of crime, the researchers found that they were able to identify 449 crimes in 115 films, an average of 3.9 crimes per film. Also 84 per cent of these films

(97 films) had 1 or more crime depicted. Who commits the crimes? The hero was responsible for causing 21 per cent of violent deaths, while the villain was responsible for 39 per cent. Deaths by violence occurred in 45 of the 115 films, or 39 per cent. A revolver was the most frequently used method of committing and attempting murder, and was used for 20 murders in 18 different films. Dale concluded from this part of the analysis that "violent means are often used to settle disputes. Further, the hero and other characters are frequently shown as settling their problems in this fashion."²⁸

The section on crime in Dale's study is most revealing; and having been the beneficiary of the seminal work by Blumer, and Thurstone in earlier studies,²⁹ he voiced his objections to the preponderance of this type of content:

There is no objection to showing crime as a social fact, but there is grave danger that due to this excessive and dramatic way of presenting crime, those whose judgements are immature and unformed may be given an acquaintance-ship with crime that tends to give them a very incorrect notion about modern life. They are likely to conclude that all life is inconsiderate, intolerant, and brutish. Such a view is likely to breed a lack of confidence in one's fellow men, to develop unwholesome suspicions, to interfere with a normal emotional development, to foster distrust.³⁰

These sentiments (which are common throughout all twelve of the Payne Fund Studies), are still being echoed today. The importance of the Dale study lies in its attempt to quantify that which had previously been only myth, and it continues to be a landmark in content analysis research.³¹

2. Dorothy Jones' Content Analyses

As an adjunct to Leo Rosten's seminal study Hollywood, the Movie Colony, the Movie Makers, published in 1941, which was

concerned with a survey of who makes the movies, Dorothy Jones undertook a study of motion picture content.³² Having benefitted from Dale's study, Jones spent over three months in creating and testing various schedules which would allow for a complete and accurate record of the relevant aspects of film content. No attempt was made to obtain a scientific sample of the Hollywood product, for as she noted: "every film produced by the motion picture industry is, in a sense, unique, so that we seriously question whether it would be possible to make any sample which could be called representative."³³

Miss Jones studied one hundred films which were released between April 1941 and February 1942. Seventy per cent were part of the fall and winter product of 1941-42. Ninety-five per cent of the pictures analyzed were produced by the seven major motion picture producing companies. The breakdown of types is indicated in Table I-2

TABLE I-2

MOTION PICTURE CONTENT, 1941-42

<u>Type</u>	<u>No.</u>
Pure Romance	15
Current political or social problems	14
General social, economic, or political problems	12
Musicals	12
Romantic comedies	9
Mystery or murder	9
Gangster or racketeer	7
Westerns	4
Children	4
Historical or biographical	4
Stapstick comedies	4
Pure fantasy	3
Other	3

Source: D. Jones, Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content, p. 416.

a) Whom are the movies about?

In the one hundred films there were 188 major characters. Of this total, 126 were men and 62 women. It was also found that approximately sixty per cent of the major characters were "independent adults"—that is, they were shown as economically established, free of parental influence, usually unmarried, and with definitely limited social and economic responsibilities.^{3 4} (Dorothy Jones noted that such people are seldom found in real life, and this could well be called "movie age.") Regarding marital status, 69.7 per cent of the major characters were shown as single, and 18.6 per cent as married. The remaining 11.7 per cent were either single with a promise of marriage, or divorced, separated, or widowed. In terms of ethnic origin or nationality, 81.4 per cent of the heroes and heroines were Americans.

b) What are the movies about?

Dorothy Jones and her researchers developed an index for analyzing the "wants" of major characters, and they came up with an early version of a "cultural index." The study noted:

. . . if the films reflect at all our changing social and political scene, one would expect that the problems of screen characters would change—that the characters would be shown increasingly as facing problems similar to those which are being faced by people today the world over . . . We suggest that a study of the "wants" of major characters, if followed over a period of time, might serve as an excellent index of changing film content.^{3 5}

Three "wants" were clearly identified: Safety included values concerned with health, bodily integrity, or life. Income referred to money and/or material goods. Deference (in the sense of response or recognition) included such values as power, fame or reputation, rightness (i.e. the self-satisfaction

of doing one's duty), idealism (for a way of living), and love or affection.³⁶ Four-fifths of the values of the 188 major characters fell into one of the three general categories, the other fifth cutting across several of these.

c) The importance of "love"

Of the total of 188 major characters: 68.1 per cent wanted love; 26.1 per cent wanted fame, reputation, or prestige; 15.9 per cent wanted safety (either health, bodily integrity, or safety of life); 13.8 per cent wanted a way of life; 9.6 per cent wanted money or material goods; 9.0 per cent wanted "rightness"—to do their duty. Interestingly enough, the study found that 61.2 per cent of all major characters were indulged with respect to all of their "wants" at the end of the film; while 10.1 per cent were deprived as to all of their "wants" at the close of the picture.

In conclusion the study raised many significant questions about the movies as a "cultural indicator." For example, the data suggested that the film holds "ideal marriage" above every other value—yet rarely carried the hero and heroine beyond the marriage ceremony. As Dorothy Jones noted: "If marriage is idealized in the movies, but rarely realistically shown, what effect, if any, does this have upon the success of marriage in our culture?"³⁷

3. The War Film

In 1945, Dorothy Jones reported on the second of her content analyses—this time it was a detailed summary of her research findings while she had been head of the Film Reviewing and Analysis Section of the Hollywood office of the Office of

War Information (O.W.I.). This study did not deal with "violence" as such, but analyzed the contribution of American "war films" and "the way in which they met their responsibilities to their nation and to the United Nations during wartime."³⁸ The study examined the content of Hollywood feature films for the years 1942 to 1944, and judged their performance against the criteria established by the O.W.I. under the general rubrick, "Will This Picture Help Win The War?"

In the final analysis, Dorothy Jones estimated that of the 1,313 motion pictures released during the first three important war years, only 45 or 50 "added significantly, both at home and abroad, in increasing understanding of the conflict," and that only one out of ten war films made such a contribution.³⁹ This study is particularly important because it represents one of the first major attempts to examine in-depth one particular aspect of film content and its cultural and social effects.

4. The Warner Bros. Study

In 1950, Dorothy Jones reported on the study she had undertaken for the Warner Bros. studio. This study still constitutes the most complete content analysis ever made of one film studio's output.⁴⁰ The reason for doing this study was to show the wide diversity of content emanating from a studio "factory." As she noted:

There is a saying in Hollywood that any actor, writer, director or producer is only as good as his last picture. This saying might also be applied to the industry as a whole: Hollywood (i.e. the motion picture industry) is usually judged by the public to be as good—or as bad—as its last picture—that is to say, the last picture which caused any stir of attention.⁴¹

In order to obtain a more accurate picture of their output,

Warner Bros. engaged Ms. Jones to undertake a two-year survey of all the films the studio had ever produced. The primary purpose was to classify and catalogue the main topics treated on the screen by the studio during its thirty years of production. The final result allowed the studio to see which topics had been treated, and which themes had received little exploration. In all, 1,200 films were analyzed, the entire product of the studio for the years 1917-1947.

Unfortunately, while the article described the methodology of the study in great detail, the actual findings were not reported, and as far as can be ascertained, Warner Bros. never did release the material. Nevertheless, the methodology described, particularly as it relates to the typology classification, is most useful.

5. The Wolfenstein and Leites Study

In 1950, Martha Wolfenstein and Nathan Leites published their psychoanalytic study, Movies: A Psychological Study. The authors' premise for this study was based upon the hypothesis that "where a group of people share a common culture, they are likely to have certain day-dreams in common. . . . The common day-dreams of a culture are in part the sources, in part the products of its popular myths, stories, plays and films."⁴² Thus they examined all the American-produced major ("A") films with a contemporary urban setting released in New York City for the year following September, 1945; and all the "A" melodramas between September 1, 1946, and January 1, 1948.

The result of this research was a remarkable study which attempted to match cultural patterns in America with themes in

Hollywood movies. Among their more publicized discoveries was the "good-bad girl,"—a female character who appears to be bad, but who is, in actual fact, as virginal as the girl next door. Thus the hero "has a girl who has attracted him by an appearance of wickedness, and whom in the end he can take home and introduce to Mother."⁴³ This study is rich in content, and provides a provocative guide to the "subconscious" development of the dominant themes of American films. As the authors noted, "Where these productions gain the sympathetic response of a wide audience, it is likely that their producers have tapped within themselves a reservoir of common day-dreams. The corresponding day-dreams, imperfectly formed and only partially conscious, are evoked in the audience and given more definite shape."⁴⁴

6. The New Zealand Study

In 1950, Gordon Mirams, the chief government censor and registrar of films in New Zealand reported on a detailed content analysis he had made of 100 feature films which entered New Zealand in the four months between the end of December, 1949, and the end of April, 1950. (70 of these were of U.S. origin.)⁴⁵ It was in the area of crime and violence that Mirams' findings are most interesting. Taking crime and acts of violence together under one heading, he found that in the 100 films examined, there was a total of 659 recorded instances of crime and violence: an average of 6.6 per film. Only 14 of the films were entirely free from any display of either crime or violence. However, if only the American productions are considered, there were 550 crimes or acts of

violence in 70 films—an average of 7.8 such acts per film. (This was exactly double the earlier finding of Dale's survey.) Only 8 of the 70 American films were free from violent acts.⁴⁶ The 24 British films in the survey averaged 4.3 criminal and violent acts per film.

Mirams found that murder was the most frequent crime portrayed on the screen, but he was shocked to find that one half of all films contained at least one act of murder committed or attempted, and that the murder rate was more than three per film. (Specifically, there were 168 murders in 47 films. Here again, Dale's findings in 1933 showed the murder rate at roughly two per film.) It should be noted that nearly half of the murders (73) took place in just 17 Western films.⁴⁷ What was also noteworthy was that 36 per cent of the total deaths were caused by "heroes," mostly in the course of bringing criminals to justice or retribution, or in self-defense.⁴⁸ The gun, once again, was the most favoured weapon, figuring in 147 acts of murder or violence. Mirams noted of guns:

The gun in films is carried almost as a matter of course—as one might carry a cigarette case, and it is produced just about as casually. To judge by Hollywood product, it has been nearly as essential a part of the average American household as an icebox.⁴⁹

. . . Making all allowances for the formal and stereotyped pattern of much screen violence and crime—which could arguably be its most disquieting aspect, since it comes to be accepted as normal—and giving due weight to all familiar arguments about catharsis, escapism, and fictional license, one is still left with a big question mark as to whether the cinema can be as innocent in its influence on social attitudes as its apologists insist.⁵⁰

D. The State of Motion Picture Content Analysis

Since the mid-1950's and the advent of television, there has been little or no interest in undertaking detailed analyses

of movie content. There have been a few specialized exceptions: In 1956, as part of his study of "Blacklisting" in the motion picture industry for The Fund of the Republic, John Cogley prepared detailed tables on the changing thematic content of American films in the period 1947-1954. Essentially this showed a decline in interest in films dealing with "social and psychological problems," and an increase in "crime and crime investigations," "adventure," and "war and military."⁵¹

George Gerbner published his comprehensive cross-cultural study in 1969, which examined 341 films from six countries, in which 667 "film heroes" were analyzed.⁵² The study found that heroes were mainly male nationals of the producing countries (United States, France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia), while the majority of leading characters in all countries were under 30 years of age.⁵³ Regarding violence, films without scenes of physical violence were rare in all countries except Czechoslovakia. Surprisingly, Italian films were the most violent, and the frequency of overt violence was generally higher in the films of Western than of Eastern Europe. As Table I-3 indicates, the films of the communist countries have less overall violent content, than do the films of western countries. Quite clearly the type of social content prevalent in the films affected the portrayal of violence and crime. "Personally motivated criminality and violence were more characteristic of U.S. and Western European films and socially motivated transgressions in Eastern European films, with Italian films having the largest share of both."⁵⁴

Since the Gerbner study there have been no further studies of movie content of any consequence which deal with violence or

TABLE I-3

SELECTED ASPECTS OF POLITICAL, SOCIAL, LEGAL AND PATRIOTIC GOALS

<u>Important Theme</u>	<u>United States</u>	<u>France</u>	<u>Italy</u>	<u>Yugo-slavia</u>	<u>Poland</u>	<u>Czecho-slovakia</u>
(Percent of Films)						
Political	6	6	3	14	18	21
Patriotic	5	11	3	10	23	12
Prejudice, intolerance	3	6	-	14	18	3
(Percent of Characters)						
Struggle for human rights	4	1	4	3	17	9
Revolutionary or resistance fighter	2	2	6	12	9	9
Victim of prejudice, discrimination	4	5	4	10	17	7
Habitual or professional lawbreaker	12	14	11	5	6	4
Motivated by --						
Nationalism	3	7	21	12	24	9
Ideal of Justice	13	17	33	12	23	62

Source: Gerbner, The Film Hero, A Cross-Cultural Study, p. 47.

crime, a point noted by the United States National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence in 1969.⁵⁵ While there have been systematic studies by Jowett of the historical content of films;⁵⁶ and by Shain of "war movies,"⁵⁷ these do not deal specifically with crime or violence. The following study therefore represents one of the first attempts at a systematic analysis of violent film content in over a decade.

Based upon a random sample of films exhibited in 1975, this study achieves a level of analysis unmatched by any of the previous studies of this nature. In particular, the attempt to examine the "aesthetics" of screen violence, or the manner in which the filmmaker has constructed violent scenes, is quite unique.

The motion picture is still a very potent entertainment and socializing medium, and as such deserves wider understanding and investigation. It is hoped that this study will help to restore interest in further research into motion picture content.

ENDNOTES

¹For more details on the introduction of the movies, and the various responses to this phenomenon, see Garth Jowett, Film: The Democratic Art (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976).

²Ibid., pp. 88-91, 95-100.

³Lewis Jacobs, The Rise of the American Film (New York: Teacher's College Press, 1939), p. 67.

⁴Alexander Wallar, Stardom (New York: Stein and Day, 1970), p. 61.

⁵Editorial in Review of Reviews, December, 1908, pp. 744-745.

⁶Jacobs, p. 156.

⁷Ibid., p. 397.

⁸John Baxter, Hollywood in the Thirties (New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1968), p. 36.

⁹Mary G. Hawks, Motion Pictures: A Problem for the Nation (Washington: National Council for Catholic Women, 1933), p. 3.

¹⁰Jowett, Film: The Democratic Art, pp. 294-306.

¹¹Dorothy Jones, "Hollywood War Films," Hollywood Quarterly, Vol. 1 (1945), pp. 1-19; Russell Shain, An Analysis of Motion Pictures About War Released by the American Film Industry, 1939-1970 (New York: Arno Press, 1976).

¹²Jones, "Hollywood War Films," p. 13.

¹³For an excellent overview of films of the 1950's, see Gordon Gow, Hollywood in the Fifties (New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1971).

¹⁴For an extended discussion of the composition of audiences see Jowett, Film: The Democratic Art, pp. 375-377, 455- 456.

¹⁵For a detailed examination of the history of American pornographic films and their audiences, see Kenneth Turan and Stephen F. Zito, Sinema (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974).

¹⁶The more provocative among these studies are Siegfried Kracauer, From Caligari to Hitler (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947); Martha Wolfenstein and Nathan Leites, Movies: A Psychological Study (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950); Andrew Bergman, We're In The Money: Depression America and Its Films (New York: New York University Press, 1971); Julian Smith, Looking Away (New York: Charles Scribner's

Sons, 1975); Michael Wood, America In The Movies (New York: Basic Books, 1975); and Raymond Durnat, A Mirror For England (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971). There are also many articles dealing with this relationship.

¹⁷George Gerbner, "Toward 'Cultural Indicators': The Analysis of Mass Mediated Public Message Systems," Audio Visual Communications Review, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Summer, 1969), pp. 140-141.

¹⁸Much of the foregoing analysis of the "filmic experience" is inspired by Herbert Blumer, "Moulding of Mass Behaviour Through The Motion Picture," American Sociological Society Publications, Vol. XXIX, No. 3 (August, 1935), pp. 115-127.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 124-125.

²⁰Jowett, Film: The Democratic Art, develops the concept of local vs. national control as a major factor in the film censorship battle which has raged ever since the introduction of the medium.

²¹Blumer, "Moulding of Mass Behaviour," p. 125.

²²Herbert Blumer, Movies and Conduct (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1933), p. 196.

²³Edgar Dale, The Content of Motion Pictures (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1935).

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 22.

²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 129.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 130.

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 136.

²⁹Blumer, Movies and Conduct; Ruth C. Peterson and L. L. Thurstone, Motion Pictures and the Social Attitudes of Children (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1933).

³⁰Dale, The Content of Motion Pictures, p. 140.

³¹It should be pointed out that this study, together with all the Payne Fund Studies was criticized on methodological grounds. In particular see Mortimer Adler, Art and Prudence (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1937), pp. 350-365. Adler is concerned that Dale's data do not allow him to make the assumptions on "effects" that he does.

³²Dorothy B. Jones, "Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 6 (Sept., 1942), pp. 411-428.

³³Ibid., p. 415.

³⁴Ibid., p. 417.

³⁵Ibid., p. 419.

³⁶Ibid., p. 420.

³⁷Ibid., p. 423.

³⁸Dorothy B. Jones, "The Hollywood War Film: 1942-1944," Hollywood Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 1 (1945), pp. 1-19.

³⁹Ibid., p. 12.

⁴⁰Dorothy B. Jones, "Quantitative Analysis of Motion Picture Content," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 14, No. 3 (Fall, 1950), pp. 554-558.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 554.

⁴²Martha Wolfenstein and Nathan Leites, Movies: A Psychological Study (Glencoe: Free Press, 1950), p. 13. This section is adapted from Jowett, Film: The Democratic Art, p. 373.

⁴³Wolfenstein and Leites, p. 27.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 13.

⁴⁵Gordon Mirams, "Drop That Gun!" The Quarterly of Radio, Television, Film, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Fall, 1951), pp. 1-19.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 4.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 11.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 14.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 16.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹John Cogley, Report on Blacklisting, Vol. I: Movies (New York: The Fund For The Republic, Inc., 1956), see pp. 282-283.

⁵²George Gerbner, The Film Hero: A Cross-Cultural Study (Lexington, Kentucky: The Association for Education in Journalism, 1969).

⁵³Ibid., p. 51.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 52.

⁵⁵William R. Catton, "The Content and Context of Violence in the Mass Media," Mass Media and Violence (Washington: A Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, Vol. XI, 1969), p. 425. The Report noted: "The lack of any recent analyses of movies precludes an analysis of that medium's content."

⁵⁶Garth S. Jowett, "The Concept of History in American Produced Films: An Analysis of the Films Made in the Period 1950-1961," Journal of Popular Culture, Vol. 3, No. 4 (Spring, 1970), pp. 799-813.

⁵⁷Russell E. Shain, An Analysis of Motion Pictures About War Released by the American Film Industry, 1939-1970 (New York: Arno Press, 1976).

CHAPTER II

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FILMS

A. All Films

1. General Characteristics

Of the 25 films included in the sample, 20 per cent were Canadian produced, 60 per cent were U.S. produced, 12 per cent were produced by other countries and 8 per cent were co-productions (Table II-1). Considering that both co-productions involved U.S. companies, the U.S. percentage could, in reality, be considered to be 68 per cent. These figures vary greatly from the figures for country of origin of films classified for fiscal year 1975. Calculations from figures contained in the Theatres Branch's Annual Report produced the following: Canada 3.2 per cent, U.S. 57.8 per cent, and other 39.0 per cent.¹ The large proportion of Canadian films were included to provide sufficient information for comparison with non-Canadian films, and the "Other" category contains many films which have very limited distribution and hence are not very popular (which was a consideration used to stratify and weight the sample).²

As to film classifications, the films included in the sample consisted of 3 "General Exhibition," 11 "Adult Entertainment" and 11 "Restricted" films³ (Table II-2). This composition resulted in a slight over-representation of Adult films at the expense of General ones, in comparison to the breakdown for these categories for all films classified

TABLE II-1
PRODUCTION SOURCE FOR ALL FILMS

Canada	20.0%
U.S.A.	60.0
Co-production	8.0
Other	<u>12.0</u>
	100.0%

TABLE II-2
ONTARIO THEATRES BRANCH'S CLASSIFICATIONS
FOR FILMS IN THE SAMPLE AND FOR
ALL FILMS CLASSIFIED IN ONTARIO FOR FISCAL YEAR 1975

	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 1975</u>
General Exhibition	16.0%	20.2%
Adult Entertainment	44.0	39.1
Restricted	<u>40.0</u>	<u>40.7</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Annual Report, Theatres Branch, Ministry of Consumer
and Corporate Relations, April 30, 1976.

by the Theatres Branch during fiscal year 1975.⁴ The sample breakdown is also very close to the distribution of Motion Picture Association of America movie ratings for the November 1974 to October 1975 period in the U.S. (allowing for the slight difference in classification systems⁵) (Table II-3). It should be noted that there was no variation whatsoever between Canadian and U.S. films in the sample in terms of classification (Table II-4).

The single largest category of film type represented was the crime film (Table II-5). Drama was the second largest category, followed by comedy and adventure. The remainder of the sample was composed of one documentary, one musical and one children's film.⁶

The vast majority of the films (68 per cent) were set in the present or the immediate past (i.e. 1965 to the present). The main mode of depiction was "plausible fiction" (i.e. both the setting and characters were plausible but there was no claim to depict actual events or people) (Table II-6). In fact a majority of all films (52 per cent) were plausible fictions set in the present or immediate past.

Finally, an overwhelming majority of films (80 per cent) were closed narratives. This means that all the elements of the narrative have been drawn together, all questions arising from the film have been answered and all situations presented in the film have been resolved by the time of its conclusion. In effect, these films present closed or self-contained experiences for the viewer. They are not meant to and do not arouse or stimulate the viewer (emotionally, intellectually or otherwise) beyond the viewing experience itself. The

TABLE II-3
MOTION PICTURE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
FILM RATINGS FOR NOVEMBER 1974 - OCTOBER 1975 PERIOD

General	13.0%
Parental Guidance	35.0
Restricted	48.0
X-Rated	<u>4.0</u>
	100.0%

Source: Variety, November 5, 1976

TABLE II-4
ONTARIO THEATRES BRANCH'S CLASSIFICATIONS FOR
CANADIAN AND U.S. FILMS IN THE SAMPLE

	<u>Canada</u>	<u>U.S.</u>
General Exhibition	20.0%	20.0%
Adult Entertainment	40.0	40.0
Restricted	<u>40.0</u>	<u>40.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE II-5
CATEGORIES OF FILM TYPE

Documentary	4.0%
Musical	4.0
Children	4.0
Comedy	16.0
Drama	24.0
Crime	36.0
Adventure	<u>12.0</u>
	100.0%

TABLE II-6
FILM REALITY BY DATE OF MAJOR ACTION

	<u>1900 to WW2</u>	<u>WW2 to 1965</u>	<u>1965 to Present</u>	<u>Future</u>	<u>Other Time Periods, Shifts Over Time Periods</u>
Completely Fantastic	--	--	5.9%	100.0%	--
Fantastic and Plausible	--	--	17.6	--	--
Plausible Fiction	75.0	--	76.5	--	50.0
Specific Depiction	<u>25.0</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>50.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

implications of this phenomenon will be dealt with in greater detail in Chapter VI.

2. Tone

The films were coded for a variety of tones or moods they conveyed. The films were assessed as to whether or not they were: funny, exciting, interesting, educational, accurate, serious, plausible, predictable, violent, suspenseful, entertaining, sensual and tragic.

Table II-7 gives the results for all the films? They were found to be quite interesting and entertaining, somewhat serious, exciting and violent, and slightly plausible, accurate and suspenseful. They were also slightly unpredictable, somewhat non-tragic and "unfunny" and very non-educational and non-sensual.

TABLE II-7
SCORES FOR ALL FILMS ON "TONES"

<u>Tones</u>	
Funny	- 9
Exciting	7
Interesting	13
Educational	-17
Accurate	1
Serious	9
Plausible	3
Predictable	- 3
Violent	5
Suspenseful	3
Entertaining	15
Sensual	-21
Tragic	- 7

3. Global Messages

The films were also assessed as to the evidence they presented on a long list of general messages about society (42 items). It was found that just over half of the messages were only very weakly supported or negated in the films, but that there was a range of strong and weak evidence for and against the remainder⁸ (Table II-8).

The picture presented by these films is of a world in which there is a substantial element of danger and a certain amount of clandestine plotting by politicians of which most people are not aware, but one in which crime does not pay. Perhaps as a result, it is a difficult place in which to succeed. Nonetheless people do seem to like their jobs despite the fact that bosses must be strict to gain respect.

The films display a rather confined social environment, however, in that while the family is important and people get support from it and their friends, they cannot really rely on others. In such an environment, people are seen as being either weak or strong. The best ways of interacting with people are to be straightforward but also assertive, aggressive, pushy and strict. In addition, the best way of dealing with conflict is to take some form of aggressive or violent action, such action being justified if one believes one is morally right.

The area of social relations is pictured somewhat less schematically: relations with others are not simple, direct or conflict-free, and marriage problems associated with living together are not easily handled.

TABLE II-8
SCORES ON GLOBAL MESSAGES
FOR ALL FILMS

* World is dangerous	14
Downtown is dangerous	3
* Crime doesn't pay	11
Children aren't safe	3
Aggression and violence are good for dealing with conflict	6
Family is important	6
Police need force	5
* Support from family and friends	10
* People like their jobs	11
People are happy	0
* Action justified if morally right	12
Marriage is easy	- 7
* Relations are simple	-17
Be kind	- 4
Be thoughtful	- 3
* Be pushy	11
* Be strict	11
* Be aggressive	15
Tell white lies	0
* Be straightforward	12
Be sarcastic	0
Be tactful	1
* Be assertive	19
Officials are indifferent	3
One must live for today	- 4
People's lot is getting worse	3
Not fair to have children	1
* People are undependable	12
Children should be taught absolute obedience to parents	1
Bosses should be strict to gain respect	7
Authoritarian police best vs. crime	1
* People either weak or strong	10
* Messages worthy of note	

Poorly bred people not accepted	2
People talk but don't work	2
An insult must be punished	5
Youth needs strictness	0
* People unaware of politicians' plots	9
Force necessary to preserve American way	4
Business more important than humanities	-1
Children should be unobtrusive	-2
Involvement isn't worth it	-3
Good things are hard to come by	6

* Messages worthy of note

4. Portrayal of Groups

The films were also judged on their portrayal or presentation of a range of different "groups." The only groups assessed that were universally portrayed in the films were "men" and "women." Of the others, minority groups⁹ were portrayed in 80 per cent of the films, the police in 68 per cent, teenagers and old people both in 48 per cent, career people¹⁰ in 40 per cent, politicians in 32 per cent and spouses of career people in 4 per cent.

Men were portrayed most positively overall, followed very closely by old people. Women occupied third place, followed by career people, teenagers, and minority groups, with police and politicians trailing behind. It should be noted that politicians had a negative presentation overall (Table II-9).

Old people are the only group that does not have at least one negative rating, and they tend to conform to the image of the old sages on whom one can depend (both in terms of ability and predictability). Men are much more active and powerful, and possibly more interesting as a result, but they are also slightly unstable, dissatisfied and foolish.

Women are slightly weak but basically stable and competent, although they are not completely satisfied with their situation. Teenagers, on the other hand, are even weaker than women and considerably less competent, but are quite stable and satisfied—in fact they are the most satisfied of all the groups.

Minority groups and career people are remarkably similar in the distribution of their scores on the attributes, the main difference being career people's much greater stability.

TABLE II-9

PRESENTATION OF GROUPS ON VARIOUS ATTRIBUTES FOR ALL FILMS

		ATTRIBUTES							
Groups	% of Films Portrayed In*	Power	Competence	Interest- ingness	Stability	Satis- faction	Activity	Wisdom	Total
Women	100%	- 4.0	12.0	20.0	9.0	-1.0	10.0	-1.0	45.0
Men	100%	14.0	9.0	23.0	-3.0	-5.0	21.0	-2.0	57.0
Teenagers	48%	-10.4	2.1	10.4	10.4	6.3	6.3	0	25.1
Old People	48%	0	16.7	14.6	10.4	2.1	4.2	8.3	56.3
Minority Groups	80%	- 2.5	8.6	12.5	0	-6.3	6.3	2.5	21.1
Career People	40%	- 4.2	5.0	10.0	12.5	-2.5	10.0	2.5	35.8
Spouses of Career People	4%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Police	68%	14.7	-2.9	2.9	1.5	-10.3	13.2	-5.9	13.2
Politicians	32%	<u>15.6</u>	<u>-6.3</u>	<u>9.4</u>	<u>-9.4</u>	<u>- 9.4</u>	<u>9.4</u>	<u>-15.6</u>	<u>-6.3</u>
Total		23.2	44.2	102.8	31.4	-26.1	80.4	-11.2	

*These percentages have been used to adjust the totals for groups not represented in all films so that for purposes of comparison the range for each attribute is -25 to +25.

Both groups are pictured as somewhat competent, interesting and active and slightly wise; however, they are also portrayed as slightly weak and dissatisfied.

The two groups portrayed least positively, the police and politicians, also have scores quite similar to each other on almost all attributes. The only difference is the slight stability of the police in comparison to the somewhat unstable politicians. As the prime representatives, among the groups coded, of authority in society, the police and politicians are portrayed as quite powerful, fairly active and somewhat interesting, but as slightly incompetent, somewhat dissatisfied and foolish (the politicians being the most foolish of all the groups).

In comparing the scores for the groups on each attribute, some interesting patterns emerge. All groups are interesting and active, for example, although there are substantial variations in degree, and men are most highly rated on both attributes. There is a general degree of competence, with only the police and politicians being presented as incompetent. Similarly most groups are stable with the exception of men and politicians, who are unstable, and minority groups, who are neutral on that attribute. There is also some consistency with regard to satisfaction: most groups are dissatisfied except teenagers and old people. The greatest variations are in terms of power and influence,¹¹ and there almost seems to be an inverse relationship between the two attributes (i.e. the more powerful the group is, the less wise it is).

5. Conflict and Non-Conflict Incidents

The study examined a number of different types of incidents, the detailed study of which is laid out in Chapter IV. The films can be described in general terms, however, on the basis of the rates of occurrence for the various incident types.¹²

The definition and the delineation of an incident was adapted from Gerbner's work on television violence.¹³ Various rules were employed to determine what, in fact, constituted an incident and how the onset and termination of such incidents were to be recognized.

A basic distinction was made between conflict and non-conflict incidents. Conflict incidents were those in which something was at issue between two or more parties whose objectives with regard to that "something-at-issue" were not compatible. Grouped under the title "conflict incidents" were: violent incidents, argument incidents and non-violent, non-argument conflict incidents. The non-conflict incidents did not revolve around situations involving such incompatible objectives and could be characterized as occurrences in which a single "agent" was active, while conflict incidents involved two (or more) active parties. Non-conflict incidents included: irrational violence, verbal abuse, harm to self, destruction of property and theft.

The total number of incidents recognized and coded was 671, for an average of 26.8 per film. (The range was very large, however, the smallest number of incidents for a single film being 2 and the largest 59, with considerable variation between those extremes.) The composition of the total number

of incidents was as follows:

TABLE II-10
THE NUMBER OF VARIOUS INCIDENT TYPES, AND
PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL NUMBER OF INCIDENTS

<u>Incident Type</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>
Violence	338	50.4
Argument	125	18.6
Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict	62	9.2
Irrational Violence	42	6.3
Verbal Abuse	27	4.0
Harm to Self	12	1.8
Destruction of Property	53	7.9
Theft	<u>12</u>	<u>1.8</u>
	671	100.0

From this table it can be seen that an overwhelming majority of the incidents (525 or 78.2 per cent or an average of 21 per film) are conflict incidents. This would seem to be understandable, if one remembers that conflict is generally a, if not the, major element of drama.¹⁴ In examining the incident types comprising the conflict category, however, it can be seen that the violent conflict incidents alone account for better than 50 per cent of all incidents. In addition, there is an average of 13.5 violent incidents, 5 argument incidents and 2.5 non-violent, non-argument conflict incidents per film (Table II-11). This means that for every reasoned discussion there are roughly two arguments and five-and-a-half violent conflicts, and for every argument there are more than two-and-

a-half violent incidents.

TABLE II-11
THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF INCIDENTS PER FILM
FOR VARIOUS INCIDENT TYPES

<u>Incident Type</u>	
Violence	13.5
Argument	5.0
Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict	2.4
Irrational Violence	1.7
Verbal Abuse	1.0
Harm to Self	0.5
Destruction of Property	2.1
Theft	<u>0.5</u>
Total	26.8

The non-conflict incidents number only 146 or 21.8 per cent of the total, for an average of 5.8 per film. Of these incidents, irrational violence and destruction of property are the two largest categories (28.8 per cent or 1.7 incidents per film and 36.3 per cent or 2.1 incidents per film respectively). Together they constitute close to two-thirds of all non-conflict incidents and 14.2 per cent of all incidents. By these standards, verbal abuse, harm to self and theft would seem to be rather insignificant in the scheme of things.

6. Ratings and Incidence of Violence

Each film was rated "as to the violence involved" on a seven-point scale (1 being least violent, 7 most violent).¹⁵ The average violence rating for the films was 4.4 which would suggest the films were somewhat violent overall (the score being almost 63 per cent of the highest possible score). There was a large variation among the films on the violence rating, as might be expected. The violence ratings for various breakdowns of the films are examined below.

The average number of violent conflict incidents per film was 13.5. If irrational violence incidents are combined with these, the average rises to 15.2 "violent" incidents per film. When compared to the figures presented by Dale and Mirams (even allowing for possible differences in the conceptualization of "violence" and "incident"), it would appear that the number of violent incidents in films doubles approximately every 20 years.¹⁶

In looking at the violence ratings and number of "violent" incidents per film for individual films, there would seem to be a highly positive correlation between the violence rating and the average number of "violent" conflict incidents per film. The lack of perfect correlation can be accounted for by the failure of the number of "violent" incidents to necessarily reflect the severity and/or graphicness of the violence involved (a factor which could contribute to an overall impression of the violence of a film) and by slight differences among coders' perception of violence. Nevertheless, both measures of violence would indicate considerable violence in the films.

B. Comparison of Canadian and Non-Canadian Films

1. Tone

The differences in tones for Canadian and non-Canadian films can be derived from Table II-12.¹⁷ While the non-Canadian films are even less funny, educational and sensual than the Canadian ones, the Canadian films are more accurate and serious. There are greater contrasts for violence and tragedy, however: the Canadian films tend to be non-violent and tragic while the non-Canadian ones are violent and not tragic. Finally, the Canadian films are less exciting, but no less interesting and entertaining.

TABLE II-12

SCORES ON "TONES" BY PRODUCTION SOURCE

<u>Tones</u>	<u>Canadian Films</u>	<u>Non-Canadian Films</u>
* Funny	- 5	-10
* Exciting	- 5	10
Interesting	15	12.5
* Educational	- 5	-20
* Accurate	5	0
* Serious	15	7.5
Plausible	5	2.5
Predictable	- 5	-2.5
* Violent	- 5	7.5
Suspenseful	5	2.5
Entertaining	15	15
* Sensual	-25	-20
* Tragic	5	-10

* Differences worthy of note

2. Global Messages

In examining the scores for the global messages of Canadian and non-Canadian films, it would seem that the non-Canadian films tend to have more support for messages dealing with the use of force, and also for those which paint a picture of optimism in the face of a somewhat hostile social environment (Table II-13). There was more support for the ideas that the world is dangerous, that people are undependable and that people are unaware of politicians' clandestine plots. In addition, non-Canadian films suggested more strongly that police often needed to use excessive force; that aggression and violence are good ways of dealing with conflict (unlike Canadian films); the best ways of interacting with people were to be pushy, aggressive and assertive but not kind; any action was permissible if a person believed himself to be right; an insult to one's honour must always be punished; and force might be necessary to preserve the true American way of life.

The picture of the interpersonal relations of the social world were more positive in other areas in the non-Canadian films, however: people received support from their family and friends, and liked their jobs. They were also somewhat more realistic in showing that relations with others were not simple, direct and conflict-free. In addition they were slightly more optimistic since people did not live just for today, concerned citizens did not get into more trouble than it was worth and good things were not necessarily hard to come by. (The latter two were contrary to the impression created by the Canadian films.)

The Canadian films suggested more strongly that the family

is important, and that children should be taught absolute obedience to their parents, but not that children should be only seen and not heard. They also suggested that people talked but did not work, and (contrary to the impression of non-Canadian films) poorly bred people would not be accepted, and that telling white lies was not a good way to interact with people.

TABLE II-13

SCORES FOR GLOBAL MESSAGES, BY PRODUCTION SOURCE

	Canadian Films	Non-Canadian Films
* World is dangerous	5	16.3
Downtown is dangerous	0	3.8
Crime doesn't pay	10	11.3
Children aren't safe	0	3.8
* Aggression and violence are good for dealing with conflict	- 5	8.8
* Family is important	10	5.0
* Police need force	0	6.3
* Support from family and friends	5	11.3
* People like their jobs	5	12.5
People are happy	0	0
* Actions justified if morally right	5	13.8
Marriage is easy	-10	- 6.3
* Relations are simple	- 5	-20.0
* Be kind	0	- 5.0
Be thoughtful	0	- 3.8
* Be pushy	5	12.5
Be strict	10	11.3
* Be aggressive	5	17.5
* Tell white lies	-10	2.5
Be straightforward	15	11.3
Be sarcastic	0	0
Be tactful	0	1.3
* Be assertive	5	22.5
Officials are indifferent	5	2.5
* One must live for today	0	-5.0
People's lot is getting worse	5	2.5
Not fair to have children	- 5	2.5
* People are undependable	0	15.0
* Children should be taught absolute obedience to parents	5	0
Bosses should be strict to gain respect	5	7.5
Authoritarian police best vs. crime	0	1.3

* Differences worthy of note.

	Canadian Films	Non-Canadian Films
People either weak or strong	10	10.0
*Poorly bred people not accepted	20	- 2.5
*People talk but don't work	10	0
*An insult must be punished	0	6.3
Youth needs strictness	0	0
*People unaware of politicians' plots	5	10.0
*Force necessary to preserve American way	0	5.0
Business more important than humanities	0	- 1.3
*Children should be unobtrusive	-10	0
*Involvement isn't worth it	5	- 5.0
*Good things are hard to come by	-15	10.0

*Differences worthy of note

3. Portrayal of Groups

The comparison of the portrayal of groups for Canadian and non-Canadian films is presented in Table II-14. If a notable difference in portrayal is considered to be one in which the production sources differ by 5 units (or 20 per cent of the highest possible absolute score) in their portrayal of a group, the comparison can be further facilitated by reducing the information to that presented in Table II-15.

In examining that table it becomes clear that Canadian films present a more positive image in almost all cases, and in most cases, a considerably more positive image. Career people would seem to be the only group which non-Canadian films portray more positively than Canadian ones. Minority groups and police are only slightly more positive in Canadian films, but women, men, old people, politicians and especially teenagers are all considerably more positive in their presentation.

TABLE II-14

COMPARISON OF PRESENTATION OF GROUPS ON VARIOUS ATTRIBUTES, BY PRODUCTION SOURCE

<u>Groups</u>	<u>Power</u>		<u>Competence</u>		<u>Interestingness</u>	
	<u>Canadian</u>	<u>Non- Canadian</u>	<u>Canadian</u>	<u>Non- Canadian</u>	<u>Canadian</u>	<u>Non- Canadian</u>
Women	-10.4	- 3.8	15.0	11.3	15.0	21.3
Men	10.4	16.3	5.0	10.0	20.0	23.8
Teenagers	-12.5	-10.0	12.5	0	24.9	7.5
Old People	0	0	25.0	13.9	16.6	13.9
Minority Groups	- 4.9	- 1.4	12.5	8.3	12.5	12.5
Career People	--	2.5	0	5.0	--	10.0
Police	12.5	15.4	0	- 3.8	- 6.3	5.8
Politicians	<u>0</u>	<u>17.9</u>	<u>-25.0</u>	<u>- 3.6</u>	<u>-25.0</u>	<u>14.3</u>
Total	- 6.3	36.9	45.0	41.1	57.7	109.1

Table II-14 (continued)

	<u>Stability</u>		<u>Satisfaction</u>		<u>Activity</u>		<u>Wisdom</u>	
	Canadian	Non- Canadian	Canadian	Non- Canadian	Canadian	Non- Canadian	Canadian	Non- Canadian
Women	20.0	6.3	10.0	-3.8	10.0	10.0	5.0	-2.5
Men	5.0	-5.0	5.0	-7.5	25.0	20.0	-5.0	-1.3
Teenagers	17.5	7.5	12.5	5.0	25.0	2.5	0	0
Old People	8.3	11.1	8.3	-	8.3	2.8	8.3	8.3
Minority Groups	-12.5	1.4	-12.5	-5.6	12.5	5.6	0	2.8
Career People	0	12.5	0	-2.5	0	10.0	0	2.5
Police	6.3	0	-6.3	-11.5	18.8	13.1	-6.3	-5.8
Politicians	-25.0	-7.2	-25.0	-7.2	25.0	7.2	-25.0	-14.3
Total	27.1	26.6	-8.0	-33.1	124.6	71.2	-23.0	-10.3

TABLE II-15

NUMBER OF ATTRIBUTES FOR WHICH THE PRESENTATION OF GROUPS

	For Canadian Films is		Is Similar	For Non-Canadian Films is	
	<u>More Positive</u>	<u>More Negative</u>		<u>More Positive</u>	<u>More Negative</u>
<u>Groups</u>					
Women	3	1	2	1	2
Men	3		2	2	2
Teenagers	5		2		
Old People	3		4		
Minority Groups	2	1	4	1	
Career People			3	4	
Police	2	1	3	1	1
Politicians	5	1		2	

4. Conflict and Non-Conflict Incidents

The comparison of the various types of incidents for the production sources can be derived from Table II-16. The average number of total incidents per Canadian film was 17.0 while for non-Canadian it was 29.3 (U.S. 27.9). The difference between the average number of conflict incidents per film was not quite as large, but was still significant (14.0 vs. 22.8). And while the total number of conflict incidents as a percentage of all incidents was higher for Canadian than non-Canadian films (82.4 per cent vs. 77.8 per cent), the more important ratio of violent conflict to reasoned discussion was much lower. In non-Canadian films, for every reasoned discussion there were 5.7 violent conflicts (5.6 for U.S. films), while in Canadian films there were only 4.6 such violent conflicts for every reasoned discussion. There were more arguments, however: 4.4 arguments per reasoned discussion in Canadian films compared to 1.7 in non-Canadian ones (2.0 in U.S.).

In comparing the non-Canadian and Canadian films in terms of the average number of incidents per film for each incident type, the non-Canadian films had a greater number of incidents for all types except arguments and irrational violence. There were 6.2 arguments in every Canadian film and only 4.7 in every non-Canadian one (5.1 in every U.S. one however). And there were 2.0 irrational violence incidents in every Canadian film but only 1.6 in every non-Canadian one (even lower at 1.2 for U.S. films). The average number of violent incidents was much greater for the non-Canadian films, however (15.4 vs. 6.4).

TABLE II-16
 AVERAGE NUMBER OF INCIDENTS PER FILM
 FOR VARIOUS INCIDENT TYPES, BY PRODUCTION SOURCE

Incident Type	Production Source				
	Canada	Non-Canadian			Total
		U.S.	Co-productions	Other	
Violence	6.4	14.1	23.5	16.0	15.4
Argument	6.2	5.1	2.5	4.3	4.7
Non-Violent Non-Argument Conflict	1.4	2.5	3.5	3.0	2.7
Irrational Violence	2.0	1.2	1.0	4.0	1.6
Verbal Abuse	0.4	1.6	0	0	1.2
Harm to Self	0	0.5	1.0	0.6	0.6
Destruction of Property	0.6	2.4	3.5	2.3	2.5
Theft	<u>0</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>0.6</u>
Total	17.0	27.9	35.0	32.3	29.3

5. Ratings and Incidence of Violence

In looking at the characteristics of the films on the basis of source of production, it seems to be the case that violence on movie theatre screens is basically an imported phenomenon (Table II-17). Non-Canadian films received a violence rating of 4.6 while Canadian films received one of only 3.8. In addition, there were more than twice as many "violent" incidents per film for non-Canadian (17.0) as compared to Canadian films (7.8).

What was somewhat surprising was the fact that co-productions and films from non-North American countries were even more violent than U.S. films (having violence ratings and number of "violent" incidents of 6.5 and 24.5, and 5.0 and 20.0 respectively). The comparable U.S. figures were 4.3 and 15.3. Considering that both co-productions¹⁸ involved American production companies, the two figures should probably be combined to yield figures of 4.5 and 16.4 for U.S.-related films. The very high figures for the non-North American films can be discounted somewhat given the small number of films involved (3), and the fact that they consisted of two crime films (whose high ratings will be described below) and a particularly violent comedy.

TABLE II-17
VIOLENCE RATING AND INCIDENCE OF VIOLENCE
FOR VARIOUS PRODUCTION SOURCES

<u>Production Source</u>	<u>Violence Rating</u>	<u>Average Number of "Violent" Incidents per Film*</u>
Canada	3.8	7.8
U.S.	4.3	15.3
Co-productions	6.5	24.5
Other	5.0	20.0
U.S.-related (U.S. + Co-productions)	4.5	16.4
Non-Canadian (U.S., co-productions and other combined)	4.6	17.0

*"Violent" incidents are violent conflict incidents plus irrational violence incidents.

C. Comparison of Popular and Not-So-Popular Films

1. Tone

A comparison of the tones for popular and not-so-popular films produce differences on all but two tones (Table II-18). Popular films are more interesting, serious and entertaining, but less educational and tragic than not-so-popular films. On the other hand, not-so-popular films are less funny than popular films but more exciting and violent.

The cases of accuracy, plausibility and suspense are more complex in that the popular and not-so-popular films tend in opposite directions on them. The popular films are accurate and plausible while the not-so-popular are not, and the not-so-popular are suspenseful while the popular are not.

TABLE II-18
SCORES ON "TONES" BY POPULARITY

<u>Tones</u>	<u>Popular Films</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular Films</u>
* Funny	- 7.4	-12.5
* Exciting	5.9	12.5
* Interesting	16.2	6.3
* Educational	-19.1	-12.5
* Accurate	4.4	- 6.3
* Serious	13.2	0
* Plausible	7.4	- 6.3
Predictable	- 1.5	- 6.3
* Violent	1.5	12.52
* Suspenseful	- 1.5	12.52
* Entertaining	19.1	6.26
Sensual	-22.1	-18.8
* Tragic	-10.3	0

* Differences worthy of note

2. Global Messages

There were a number of interesting differences between the popular and not-so-popular films for the global messages. The not-so-popular films suggested more strongly that the world is a dangerous place in which crime does not pay. This category also had more substantial evidence to the effect that people are either weak or strong, poorly bred people will not be accepted and that people talk but do not work. And contrary to popular films, they suggested that tact and thoughtfulness were not the best methods of interacting with others.

The popular films presented a world in which people like their jobs although bosses must be strict to gain respect. Also, people are less likely to live only for today. Relations with others are not simple, direct and conflict-free, however, and the problems associated with marriage are not easily dealt with. In addition, being strict is a good way of interacting with others, and aggression and violence are pictured more positively as ways of dealing with conflict. Finally, the popular films differ from the not-so-popular ones in suggesting that force may be necessary to preserve the true American way of life.

TABLE II-19

SCORES FOR GLOBAL MESSAGES, BY POPULARITY

	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So Popular</u>
* World is dangerous	11.8	18.8
Downtown is dangerous	2.9	3.1
* Crime doesn't pay	8.8	15.7
Children aren't safe	2.9	3.1
* Aggression and violence are good for dealing with conflict	8.8	0
Family is important	7.4	3.1
Police need force	4.4	6.3
Support from family and friends	10.3	9.4
* People like their jobs	14.7	3.1
People are happy	2.9	- 6.3
Actions justified if morally right	13.2	9.4
* Marriage is easy	-11.8	3.1
* Relations are simple	-19.1	-12.5
Be kind	- 2.5	- 3.1
* Be thoughtful	1.3	-12.5
Be pushy	11.8	9.4
* Be strict	13.2	6.3
Be aggressive	14.7	15.7
Tell white lies	0	0
Be straightforward	11.8	12.5
Be sarcastic	- 1.5	3.1
* Be tactful	3.8	- 6.3
* Be assertive	20.6	15.7
Officials are indifferent	1.5	6.3
* One must live for today	- 5.8	0
People's lot is getting worse	1.5	6.3
Not fair to have children	1.5	0
People are undependable	13.2	9.4
Children should be taught absolute obedience to parents	1.5	0
* Be strict to gain respect	8.8	3.1
Authoritarian police best vs. crime	2.9	- 3.1
* People either weak or strong	7.4	15.7

* Differences worthy of note

	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Popular</u>
* Poorly bred people not accepted	0	6.3
* People talk but don't work	0	6.3
An insult must be punished	5.9	3.1
Youth needs strictness	0	0
People unaware of politicians' plots	10.3	6.3
* Force necessary to preserve American way	7.4	- 3.1
Business more important than humanities	- 1.5	0
Children should be unobtrusive	- 1.5	- 3.1
Involvement isn't worth it	- 4.4	0
Good things are hard to come by	7.4	3.1

* Differences worthy of note

3. Portrayal of Groups

The attribute-by-attribute comparison of the portrayal of the various groups by popular and not-so-popular films is presented in Table II-20 and the overall comparison in Table II-21.

From Table II-21 it can be seen that the differences between popularity levels are not as clear-cut as they were for the production sources. Teenagers and career people are clearly more positively portrayed in not-so-popular films, while men are more positive in popular films. Beyond that the differences are small, and move in both directions, although in balance the popular films appear more positive for the remainder. Old people, minority groups, the police and politicians are all very slightly more positive in popular films, while women are slightly more positive in not-so-popular films and politicians are much more negatively portrayed.

TABLE II-2C

COMPARISON OF PRESENTATION OF GROUPS ON VARIOUS ATTRIBUTES, BY POPULARITY

Groups	<u>Power</u>		<u>Competence</u>		<u>Interestingness</u>	
	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-so- Popular</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-so- Popular</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-so- Popular</u>
Women	- 1.5	- 9.4	11.8	12.5	23.5	12.5
Men	16.2	9.4	11.8	3.1	25.0	18.8
Teenagers	-11.1	- 8.3	- 2.8	16.6	8.3	16.6
Old People	2.8	- 8.3	19.4	8.2	16.6	8.3
Minority Groups	0	8.3	12.5	0	14.3	8.3
Career People	6.3	0	3.1	12.5	9.4	12.5
Police	16.7	10.0	- 4.2	0	6.2	- 5.0
Politicians	<u>16.7</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-25.0</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>-12.5</u>
Total	46.1	14.2	51.6	27.9	120.0	59.5

Table II-20 (continued)

	<u>Stability</u>		<u>Satisfaction</u>		<u>Activity</u>		<u>Wisdom</u>	
	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-so- Popular</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-so- Popular</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-so- Popular</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-so- Popular</u>
Women	5.9	15.6	- 4.4	6.3	9.4	10.3	- 1.5	0
Men	-4.4	0	- 7.4	- 5.0	21.9	20.6	- 1.5	- 3.1
Teenagers	8.3	16.6	2.8	16.6	3.8	2.8	0	0
Old People	8.3	16.6	0	8.3	0	5.5	8.3	8.3
Minority Groups	0	0	- 5.4	- 8.3	4.2	7.1	3.6	0
Career People	9.4	25.0	- 9.4	25.0	0	12.5	3.1	0
Police	0	5.0	-10.4	-10.0	15.0	12.5	- 6.2	- 5.0
Politicians	-4.2	-25.0	- 4.2	-25.0	25.0	4.2	-12.5	-25.0
Total	23.3	53.8	-38.4	7.9	79.3	75.5	- 6.7	-24.8

TABLE II-21

NUMBER OF ATTRIBUTES FOR WHICH THE PRESENTATION OF GROUPS

Groups	For Popular Films is		Is Similar	For Not-So-Popular Films is	
	<u>More Positive</u>	<u>More Negative</u>		<u>More Positive</u>	<u>More Negative</u>
Women	1	1	3	2	1
Men	3		4		
Teenagers		1	3	4	
Old People	3		1	3	1
Minority Groups	2		4	1	
Career People	1	1	2	4	
Police	2		4	1	1
Politicians	2		1		5

4. Conflict and Non-Conflict Incidents

Comparisons of the various incident types produce some interesting results for popularity levels. It should be noted at the outset of the analysis, however, that the "popularity" construct, for certain portions of the analysis at least, contains elements of "production source." This is a result of the method by which the sample was stratified on the basis of popularity of Canadian and non-Canadian films (see Appendix A).

An examination of Table II-22 discloses that an inverse relationship between popularity and total number of incidents per film holds for non-Canadian films but not for Canadian ones. The average number of conflict incidents per film displayed a similar pattern, but the Canadian films were at a much lower level. The number of conflict incidents for categories 1-5 (as so designated in Table II-22) were: 20.9, 21.8, 27.0, 17.5 and 11.7 respectively. It was found, however, that higher percentages of conflict incidents occurred in the least popular non-Canadian (81.3 per cent) and not-so-popular Canadian films (85.3 per cent), than in the very popular non-Canadian, moderately popular non-Canadian and popular Canadian films (75.2, 77.7 and 79.5 per cent respectively).

The ratios between violent conflict incidents and reasoned discussion demonstrated an inverse relationship with popularity for both non-Canadian and Canadian films. For the very, moderately and least popular non-Canadian films these ratios were 3.8, 5.0 and 12.4 respectively; for popular Canadian films it was 2.6 and for not-so-popular Canadian, 9.0. There was no such systematic relationship for the argument/reasoned discussion ratios. The highest occurred in the not-so-popular

Canadian films (6.7).

TABLE II-22
AVERAGE NUMBER OF INCIDENTS PER FILM
FOR VARIOUS INCIDENT TYPES, BY POPULARITY LEVELS

<u>Incident Types</u>	(1) Very Popular Non- Canadian	(2) Mod. Popular Non- Canadian	(3) Least Popular Non- Canadian	(4) Popular Canadian	(5) Not-So- Popular Canadian
Violence	12.9	13.1	22.4	6.5	6.3
Argument	4.6	6.1	2.8	8.5	4.7
Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict	3.4	2.6	1.8	2.5	0.7
Irrational Violence	1.5	2.3	0.8	4.0	0.7
Verbal Abuse	1.8	1.4	0	0.5	0.3
Harm to Self	0.3	0.6	1.2	0	0
Destruction of Property	2.5	1.6	3.8	0	1.0
Theft	<u>0.9</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	27.8	28.1	33.2	22.0	13.7

The other ratios (in descending order) were: popular Canadian, 3.4; moderately popular non-Canadian, 2.3; least popular non-Canadian, 1.5; and very popular non-Canadian, 1.4.

As for the other types of incidents, there is an inordinate amount of irrational violence in popular Canadian films. Also notable was the low amount of irrational violence in the least popular non-Canadian, and the higher amounts for very popular and especially for moderately popular non-Canadian films. The remaining incident types were almost non-existent for Canadian

films. For the non-Canadian films, the inverse relationship holds only for harm to self, and is reversed for verbal abuse and theft. The least popular non-Canadian films had the highest rates of destruction of property, followed by the very popular then the moderately popular.

5. Ratings and Incidence of Violence

If one looks initially at the "purer" divisions on popularity (bottom of Table II-23), it can be seen that the tendency toward inverse relationships noted above also holds for degree of popularity and level of violence: the less popular the film, the more violent it was.¹⁹ This relationship existed for both three-level and two-level divisions of popularity, and for both violence ratings and number of "violent" incidents per film as measures of violence.²⁰

TABLE II-23
VIOLENCE RATING AND INCIDENCE OF VIOLENCE
FOR VARIOUS POPULARITY LEVELS

<u>Popularity Level</u>	<u>Violence Rating</u>	<u>Average Number of "Violent" Incidents per Film*</u>
1) Very Popular Non-Canadian	3.6	14.4
2) Moderately Popular Non-Canadian	4.6	15.4
3) Least Popular Non-Canadian	6.2	23.2
4) Popular Canadian	4.5	10.5
5) Not-So-Popular Canadian	3.3	7.0
Popular (1+4)	3.8	13.6
Moderately Popular (2)	4.6	15.4
Not-So-Popular (3+5)	5.1	17.1
Popular (1+2+4)	4.1	14.4
Not-So-Popular (3+5)	5.1	17.1

*"Violence" Incidents are violent conflict incidents plus irrational violence incidents.

When one examines the "mixed" division of popularity, however, the inverse relationship between popularity and level of violence holds for the non-Canadian films only. For the Canadian films the reverse was true: the more popular the film, the more violent it was. Table II-22 would seem to indicate that this difference was largely a result of the much larger number of irrational violence incidents in popular as opposed to not-so-popular Canadian films (4 vs. 0.7), since the number of violent conflict incidents for these two categories of Canadian films was almost the same (6.5 and 6.3 respectively).

D. Comparison of Action and Non-Action Films

In order to facilitate comparisons of tones, global messages and portrayals of groups for film types, "collapsing" (or combination) of "film type" categories was required.²¹ Since crime and adventure films rely in large part on action to maintain viewer interest and develop the narrative, it was decided to combine them into an "action" category.²² The other films were felt to be somewhat different in this regard and were consequently grouped as "non-action" films.²³

1. Tone

The comparison of the action and non-action films produces a large number of contrasts in "tones" (Table II-24). Differences in degree rather than nature of tone are seen for the tones "sensual," "tragic," "interesting," and "educational": action films are even less sensual, tragic and educational than non-action ones, but they are more interesting.

The more notable differences include the fact that the non-action films are funny (but very slightly), accurate and plausible while the action films are not, and also that action films are suspenseful, exciting and violent but non-action ones are not.

TABLE II-24

SCORES ON "TONES" BY FILM TYPE

<u>Tones</u>	<u>Action Films</u>	<u>Non-Action Films</u>
* Funny	-20.8	1.9
* Exciting	20.8	- 5.8
* Interesting	16.6	9.6
* Educational	-20.8	-13.4
* Accurate	- 8.3	9.6
Serious	8.3	9.6
* Plausible	- 4.2	9.6
Predictable	- 4.2	- 1.9
* Violent	20.8	- 9.6
* Suspenseful	16.6	- 9.6
Entertaining	16.6	13.4
* Sensual	-25.0	-17.3
* Tragic	-12.5	- 1.9

* Differences worthy of note

2. Global Messages

The action and non-action films produce greater contrasts for the general images they create of the world than did either the production source or the popularity comparisons. Force, aggression and violence are noticeably more frequent themes in the action films. The world of the action film is more dangerous and one in which police often need to use excessive force and in which force may be necessary to preserve the true American way of life (which is not the situation in non-action films).

It is also more strongly the case in action films that violence and aggression are good ways of dealing with conflict (in contrast to the case of non-action films), and that any action is justified if a person believes himself morally right. It should be understandable then that the best ways of interacting with others are to be pushy, assertive and aggressive, not kind and thoughtful (as is the case in non-action films). But while relations are even less simple, direct and conflict-free, it is even more the case that people are undependable and are either weak or strong. And in contrast to non-action films, good things are not hard to come by in the world of action films.

In addition to the differences already noted for them, non-action films demonstrated more strikingly that people like their jobs. They also tended to negate the idea that marital problems were easily dealt with, and despite the fact that they exhibited more evidence that people's lot is getting worse, they demonstrated that people did not live just for today and forget about tomorrow.

TABLE II-25

SCORES FOR GLOBAL MESSAGES, BY FILM TYPE

	Action Films	Non-Action Films
* World is dangerous	22.9	5.8
Downtown is dangerous	4.2	1.9
Crime doesn't pay	10.4	11.5
Children aren't safe	2.1	3.8
* Aggression and violence are good for dealing with conflict	16.6	- 3.8
Family is important	4.2	7.7
* Police need force	8.3	1.9
Support from family and friends	8.3	11.5
* People like their jobs	8.3	13.4
People are happy	- 4.2	3.8
* Actions justified if morally right	16.6	7.7
* Marriage is easy	0	-13.4
* Relations are simple	-22.9	-11.5
* Be kind	-16.6	7.7
* Be thoughtful	-16.6	9.6
* Be pushy	20.8	1.9
Be strict	12.5	9.6
* Be aggressive	20.8	9.6
Tell white lies	2.1	- 1.9
Be straightforward	12.5	11.5
Be sarcastic	2.1	- 1.9
Be tactful	2.1	0
* Be assertive	22.9	15.4
Officials are indifferent	4.2	1.9
* One must live for today	0	- 7.7
* People's lot is getting worse	0	5.8
Not fair to have children	2.1	0
* People are undependable	16.6	7.7
Children should be taught absolute obedience to parents	2.1	0
Be strict to gain respect	8.3	5.8
Authoritarian police best vs. crime	0	1.9
* Differences worthy of note		

	<u>Action Films</u>	<u>Non-Action Films</u>
* People either weak or strong	16.6	3.8
Poorly bred people not accepted	4.2	0
People talk but don't work	2.1	1.9
An insult must be punished	6.2	3.8
Youth needs strictness	0	0
People unaware of politicians' plots	10.4	7.7
* Force necessary to preserve American way	10.4	- 1.9
Business more important than humanities	0	- 1.9
Children should be unobtrusive	0	- 3.8
Involvement isn't worth it	- 4.2	- 1.9
* Good things are hard to come by	- 4.7	7.7

* Differences worthy of note

3. Portrayal of Groups

The comparison of the portrayal of groups for action and non-action films, as presented in Tables II-26 and II-27, reveal some interesting differences. There are some cases in which there are no or only marginal differences: teenagers, career people, men and old people. There are other, more significant differences, however, with polarized presentations in several cases. Minority groups, police and politicians are considerably more positive in action films and negative in non-action films (with the exception of politicians), while women are more negative in action films but considerably more positive in non-action films.

TABLE II-26

COMPARISON OF PRESENTATION OF GROUPS ON VARIOUS ATTRIBUTES, BY FILM TYPE

<u>Groups</u>	<u>Power</u>		<u>Competence</u>		<u>Interestingness</u>	
	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non- Action</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non- Action</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non- Action</u>
Women	-11.5	3.8	4.2	19.2	16.7	23.1
Men	18.7	10.4	10.4	8.3	22.9	23.1
Teenagers	-10.0	-10.6	5.0	0	10.0	10.7
Old People	0	0	15.6	18.7	15.6	12.5
Minority Groups	2.8	- 6.9	11.1	6.8	13.9	11.4
Career People	5.0	5.0	0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Police	18.7	11.1	3.1	- 8.3	3.1	2.8
Politicians	<u>25.0</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>- 8.3</u>	<u>- 5.0</u>	<u>16.7</u>	<u>5.0</u>
Total	48.7	22.8	41.1	49.7	108.9	98.6

Table II-26 (continued)

Groups	<u>Stability</u>		<u>Satisfaction</u>		<u>Activity</u>		<u>Wisdom</u>	
	Action	Non-Action	Action	Non-Action	Action	Non-Action	Action	Non-Action
Women	10.4	16.0	- 2.1	0	4.2	15.4	- 8.3	5.8
Men	0	-12.0	- 6.3	- 4.2	22.9	19.2	- 2.1	- 1.9
Teenagers	10.0	10.7	10.0	3.6	5.0	7.1	- 5.0	3.6
Old People	9.4	12.5	3.1	0	- 3.1	18.7	9.4	6.2
Minority Groups	5.6	- 4.5	- 2.8	- 9.1	5.6	5.1	2.8	2.3
Career People	15.0	10.0	0	- 5.0	15.0	6.8	0	5.0
Police	6.2	- 2.8	- 9.4	-11.1	15.6	11.1	0	-11.1
Politicians	- 8.3	-10.0	8.3	-20.0	0	15.0	-16.7	-15.0
Total	48.3	19.9	0.8	-45.8	65.2	98.4	-19.9	- 5.1

TABLE II-27

NUMBER OF ATTRIBUTES FOR WHICH THE PRESENTATION OF GROUPS

<u>Groups</u>	For action films is		<u>Is Similar</u>	For non-Action Films is	
	<u>More Positive</u>	<u>More Negative</u>		<u>More Positive</u>	<u>More Negative</u>
Women		2	1	6	
Men	1		5		1
Teenagers	2	1	4	1	
Old People		1	6	1	
Minority Groups	2		4		3
Career People	2		2	2	1
Police	3		3		3
Politicians	3		3	1	1

4. Conflict and Non-Conflict Incidents

In comparing the full range of film types for total number of incidents (Table II-28), crime and adventure head the list, followed by comedy, with drama and "other" far behind. The same ordering emerges when the average number of conflict incidents per film is determined: crime (26.0), adventure (25.6), comedy (17.1), drama (16.4) and other (15.3). Crime, adventure, drama and "other" films all had conflict-incidents-as-percentages-of-total-incidents at or slightly above 80 per cent (82.0, 81.7, 80.8 and 81.8 per cent respectively). Comedy's percentage, however, was much lower at only 60.4 per cent. This was in large part the consequence of the large role which irrational violence and destruction of property play in the frantic world of film comedy.

When violence/reasoned discussion ratios are examined, the ordering of the categories was altered substantially. Adventure lead the way with 14.8 incidents of violence for every reasoned discussion, followed by "other" with 12.3, crime with 7.6, comedy with 5.1 and drama with 1.4. The large figures for the adventure and "other" films were obviously the result of relatively few reasoned discussions in those film types. This is also the reason that adventure films had the largest argument-to-reasoned-discussion ratio at 3.8. The remaining figures were crime (2.2), "other" (2.0), drama (1.9) and comedy (1.3). The very low violence and argument ratios for drama films indicates a very high tendency for conflict to take the form of reasoned discussion and for argument to be a much more preferable way to deal with conflict than violence is.

As for the other types of incidents, there is little of

TABLE II-28
AVERAGE NUMBER OF INCIDENTS PER FILM
FOR VARIOUS INCIDENT TYPES, BY FILM TYPE

<u>Incident Type</u>	<u>Film Type</u>				
	<u>Adventure</u>	<u>Comedy</u>	<u>Crime</u>	<u>Drama</u>	<u>Other*</u>
Violence	19.3	11.8	18.3	5.3	12.3
Argument	5.0	3.0	5.3	7.3	2.0
Non-violent, non-argument conflict	1.3	2.3	2.4	3.8	1.0
Irrational Violence	1.0	3.0	2.1	1.2	0.3
Verbal Abuse	1.0	1.3	0.2	1.8	0
Harm to Self	1.7	0	0.7	0.2	0
Destruction of Property	1.3	4.5	2.1	0.7	2.7
Theft	<u>0.7</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	31.3	28.3	31.7	20.3	18.7

*"Other" includes one documentary, one musical and one children's film.

major importance to observe. The large amounts of irrational violence and destruction of property in comedies has already been noted. A similar but less pronounced trend is evident for crime films. The only other noteworthy figures would seem to be the rate of verbal abuse for dramas, harm to self for adventures, destruction of property for "other" and theft for comedy.

A similar comparison for all incident types for the "action"/"non-action" film type differentiation revealed that the action films had higher rates for all the conflict incident types and for irrational violence and harm to self (Table II-29). The total average number of incidents per film for action films was also higher, as was the percentage of conflict incidents (82.6 per cent vs 73.2 per cent) and both the violence and argument ratios (8.4 and 2.4 for action films, and 3.3 and 1.7 for non-action films).

TABLE II-29
AVERAGE NUMBER OF INCIDENTS PER FILM
FOR ACTION AND NON-ACTION FILMS

<u>Incident Type</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Violence	18.6	8.9
Argument	5.3	4.8
Non-violent, non-argument Conflict	2.2	2.7
Irrational Violence	1.8	1.5
Verbal Abuse	0.4	1.6
Harm to Self	0.9	0.1
Destruction of Property	1.9	2.3
Theft	<u>0.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>
Total	31.6	22.4

5. Ratings and Incidence of Violence

The measures of violence for the various types are presented in Table II-30 below.

TABLE II-30
VIOLENCE RATING AND INCIDENCE OF VIOLENCE
FOR VARIOUS FILM TYPES

<u>Film Type</u>	<u>Violence Rating</u>	<u>Average Number of "Violent" Incidents per Film*</u>
Adventure	5.0	20.3
Comedy	4.3	14.8
Crime	5.8	20.4
Drama	2.7	6.5
Other	3.7	12.7

*"Violent" incidents are violent conflict incidents plus irrational violence incidents.

Crime and adventure films were far and away the most violent types. Comedy was the next most violent, followed by "other." (The "other" category is probably somewhat over-inflated given the inclusion of a rather atypically violent documentary, Hearts and Minds, a retrospective look at the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.²⁴) Dramas were the least violent films, having only half the violence rating and one third the number of "violent" incidents per film of crime films. This progression parallels the ordering for total number of incidents and number of conflict incidents with only drama and "other" changing places at the bottom of the list.

Comparing the action and non-action groupings on violence ratings and incidence of violence, the action films were considerably more violent than the non-action films (in effect almost twice as violent on the basis of number of incidents).

TABLE II-31
VIOLENCE RATING AND INCIDENCE OF VIOLENCE
FOR ACTION AND NON-ACTION FILMS

<u>Film Type</u>	<u>Violence Rating</u>	<u>Average Number of "Violent" Incidents per Film*</u>
Action	5.6	20.4
Non-Action	3.4	10.5

*"Violent" incidents are violent conflict incidents plus irrational violence incidents.

E. Summary

In examining the characteristics of the films in this particular sample, we find both obvious and not so obvious results. As can be expected, the largest single category of motion pictures represented was the crime film, with drama, comedy and adventure as the next most frequent categories. The recent propensity to the "crime" film is a phenomenon which many social critics have noted; in the past crime was only one of several important film categories, while today it occupies more than one-third of all movie categories. The decline of musicals and comedies is especially notable, while children's films have never been an important segment of the American film market.

The high percentage of crime films is significant in that they constitute a large portion of the "action" film category. And it is action films, as a group, which have the highest ratings and incidence of violence for all production source, popularity level and film type groupings. In addition, action films stress most emphatically the necessity of using force, violence and aggression in the conduct of social relations.

On the whole, however, what do films tell us about the world around us? The examination of the "world view" is important, for it reveals not only what filmmakers think of the world, but it also reflects what the audience may want to believe about the condition of their environment. While most films, regardless of their box office popularity, were considered to be quite interesting and entertaining, they also gave an overall impression that life contained a substantial element of danger. In addition, certain groups were particularly

singled out—teenagers being shown as weak and incompetent, with police and politicians being powerful and incompetent—for strong stereotyping, although there were variations of degree. Nevertheless, the basic structure of the family was still considered important, although beyond the inner circle of family and friends the world is rather "nasty and brutish," and indeed a difficult place in which to succeed.

When examining the specific issue of violence, and its portrayal, such incidents formed the bulk of coded activity in the films. Of the 671 incidents counted in the 25 films, 525 or 78.2 per cent were conflict incidents and of those, 338 or 50.4 per cent of all incidents were violent conflicts. While this is partly explained by the necessities of dramatic action which forms the basis of most drama, the sheer amount of conflict in films is nevertheless overwhelming. Canadian films were less violent, but more tragic than non-Canadian films, but contained more irrational violence. Also, Canadian films tended to portray a more "positive" image on all levels, and provide less support for the use of force.

One interesting discovery was that popular films are more interesting, serious and entertaining, while not-so-popular films are less funny, but more exciting and violent. Surprisingly, the more popular films projected a more positive image of the world, while the not-so-popular films contained more violence. This last fact belies the popular myth that violence as a staple ingredient is a strong box office attraction.

Perhaps the most important finding was that the overwhelming majority of films were "closed narratives." This means that all the elements of the film's narratives have been

drawn together by the end of the film, and that all questions arising from the film have been answered and all situations presented in the film have been resolved. As was noted in the study (p. 36): "In effect, these films present closed or self-contained experiences for the viewer. They are not meant to and do not arouse or stimulate the viewer (emotionally, intellectually or otherwise) beyond the viewing experience itself." The implications of this concept of "closure" have yet to be fully explored by behavioural scientists, but it is a point well worth further examination.

ENDNOTES

¹Annual Report, Theatres Branch, Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations, April 30, 1976, p. 3. The discrepancy between the Theatres Branch's fiscal year focus and this study's calendar year focus is discussed in Appendix A, "The Method of Selecting the Sample."

²For a more detailed explanation of these points, see Appendix A.

³The General Exhibition category is applied to films to which all persons may be admitted, Adult Entertainment to films suggested for adults only but to which all ages may be admitted, and Restricted to those to which no one under the age of 18 years will be admitted. Until recently sexual material was the main criterion for classification purposes, but the amount and degree of violence is now being considered as well. See Garth S. Jowett, "Film Censorship in Ontario," Cinema Canada, No. 31, (October, 1976), pp. 42-45.

⁴Calculated from the Annual Report, Theatres Branch, p. 2.

⁵The MPAA ratings categories are as follows: G (All ages admitted; general audiences), PG (All ages admitted; parental guidance suggested), R (Restricted: under 17 requires accompanying parent or adult guardian) and X (No one under 17 admitted: age limit may vary in certain areas). Martin S. Dworkin, "Film Ratings Revisited," The Journal of the Producers Guild of America, Vol. 13, No. 3 (September, 1971), pp. 19-22.

⁶The study eschewed the traditional genre classifications for films (e.g. Westerns, horror films, gangster films, etc.) and adapted the classifications from the Royal Commission's content analysis of television in order to facilitate cross-media comparisons. The television content analysis utilized the categorization employed by TV Guide.

⁷The range of possible scores for "tones," "global messages" and "portrayal of groups" is -25 to +25.

⁸The strength of the evidence for (against) was designated as follows:

weak	1 - 5
somewhat/moderate	6 - 15
strong	16 - 25

⁹"Minority groups" include racial, ethnic, religious and political minorities.

¹⁰"Career people" are people who have been trained professionally for their work and whose positions or activities are regarded as more than simply "jobs"—e.g. doctors, lawyers, teachers, etc.

¹¹A factor analysis of the attributes for all groups demonstrated that 65.4 per cent of all the variation among the groups on the attributes could be explained by power. Competence was the next most powerful explanatory attribute, but accounted for only 12.8 per cent of the variation among groups. The percentage of variation accounted for by the remaining attributes were:

Interestingness	9.9 per cent
Stability	4.9 per cent
Satisfaction	3.9 per cent
Activity	1.7 per cent
Wisdom	1.4 per cent

¹²The detailed definitions of "incident" and of the various incident types are provided in Chapter IV.

¹³"Content Analysis Procedures and Results," in D. Lange, R. Baker and S. Ball (eds.), Violence and the Media (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969), pp. 519-591. "Violence in Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions," in G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (eds.), Television and Social Behavior, Vol. I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 28-188.

¹⁴For a discussion of the role of conflict in drama, see Frank Huburt O'Hara and Margueritte Harmon Bro, Invitation to the Theater (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1970), pp. 99-101.

¹⁵The description of violence for the assigning of violence ratings was as follows: "Violence is defined as action which intrudes painfully or harmfully into the physical, psychological or social well-being of persons or groups. It includes physical or psychological injury, hurt or death. It can be explicit (e.g. physical or verbal) and/or implicit (e.g. silent treatment, passive aggression, failure to assist)."

¹⁶Dale reported an average of 3.9 "crimes" per film in his study, while Mirams reported an average 6.6 "instances of crime and violence" per film for all films and 7.8 such incidents per U.S. film. Edgar Dale, The Content of Motion Pictures (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1933). Gordon Mirams, "Drop That Gun!" The Quarterly of Radio, Television, Film, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Fall, 1951), pp. 1-19.

¹⁷A difference was noted if the absolute difference between the scores was 20 per cent of the total possible range. This would be a value of 5 if the scores were of the same sign, and of 10 if the sign of the two scores were different. It should also be noted that the results for all categories of production source, popularity level and film type have been weighted so that a common range of possible values of -25 to +25 has been maintained. In some cases this meant that differences have been based on a rather small number of cases.

However, it should be remembered that the comparisons are being presented as being suggestive and not definitive.

¹⁸Co-productions which involved all non-North American parties were classified as "Other." There was one such film, The Odessa File, which was a British-German co-production.

¹⁹A similar inverse relationship between popularity and violence was reported for movies on TV for the 1961-1970 period. Violence was assessed on the basis of Movies on TV synopses and popularity was measured by A. C. Nielsen ratings. David G. Clark and William B. Blankenburg, "Trends in Violent Content in Selected Mass Media," in G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (eds.), Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 209-217.

²⁰This finding indicates that the stratification and weighting of the sample on the basis of popularity may have resulted in an underestimate of the amount of violence in films. Since a more important reason for so stratifying and weighting was to determine the characteristics of the films viewed by a large number of people, these results do not undermine the purposes of the sampling and weighting procedures.

²¹This move was necessitated by the small number of cases which would have been just slightly larger than the number of cells in the tables for the five-category designation of film type.

²²A crime film was defined as one which "tend[s] to centre on present day situations involving transgressions of the law, illegal activities, etc. and efforts to deal with same. They often take the form of police stories, gangster films, etc. A Western could be included if it dwelt on the aspects described above." An adventure film was defined as one "characterized by a preponderance of action and numerous locations (often exotic) and less detailed character and plot development in comparison to dramas." The types were ordered hierarchically from "animated" through "documentary, musical, children, comedy, crime and drama (non-crime)" to "adventure." Coders were instructed that "If a film could conceivably be coded as more than one type, code for the type located higher on the list, e.g. a musical-comedy should be coded as a musical."

²³The characteristics of the comedies in the sample (Freebie and the Bean, The Pink Panther, The Strongest Man in the World but less so for My Pleasure is My Business) were such that they were closer to the action than non-action films in terms of violence, excitement, etc. It was felt, however, that these particular films over-represented action-oriented or "slapstick" type of comedy at the expense of more cerebral (or at least verbal) approaches, and that generically comedy was closer to the non-action rather than the action pole.

²⁴The Royal Commission's content analysis of television programming would seem to indicate, however, that popular documentaries are in fact violent.

CHAPTER III
CHARACTERS AND RELATIONSHIPS

A. Characters

1. General Characteristics for All Characters

The 370 codeable characters were:

- almost evenly divided between leading characters and non-leading conflictants/violents¹ (Table III-1).
- over 80 per cent male (Table III-2).
- almost exclusively human (Table III-3).
- concentrated in the adult (19-40) and middle age (41-64) age ranges with a virtual absence of young and old people² (Table III-4).
- largely indeterminate (almost two-thirds) as to marital status, with those who could be specified almost evenly divided between singles and those who were, had been, were going to be or were de facto married (Table III-5).
- predominantly well-off, although there was an element of uncertainty about the income level of a substantial proportion of characters (Table III-6).
- overwhelming white (77.6 per cent) with white Americans being the single largest group (42.4 per cent) (Table III-7). They are probably even more prominent since "White Non-North Americans" includes whites who are identifiable "ethnics."
- scattered among the various occupational categories with the largest ones being general legal, illegal and law

TABLE III-1
DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY STATUS

Leading	49.7%
Non-Leading Violents/ Conflicants	<u>50.3</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-2
DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY SEX

Male	81.9%
Female	<u>18.1</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-3
DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY HUMANITY

Human	99.2%
Human with extra-human powers	<u>0.8</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-4
DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY AGE

Child (to 11 years)	1.4%
Adolescent (12-18)	1.4
Adult (19-40)	57.6
Middle age (41-64)	34.9
Old (65 and over)	3.2
Uncodeable	<u>1.6</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-5
DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY MARITAL STATUS

Married	10.5%
Was married at one time	3.0
Marries in story or expects to marry	1.6
In the process of breaking up	1.4
Common law relationship	1.4
Single	17.6
Unspecified	<u>64.6</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-6

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY INCOME LEVEL

Upper	28.6%
White Collar	28.9
Blue Collar	9.7
Lower	4.9
Student	2.2
Uncertain or other	<u>25.7</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-7

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY RACIAL GROUP

White Americans	42.7%
White French Canadians	0.3
White English Canadians	4.3
White North Americans (nationality not clear)	2.4
White Non-North Americans	28.1
Black North Americans	1.6
Black Non-North Americans	1.1
Orientals	9.7
Native North Americans (Indians, Inuit, Metis, etc.)	1.4
Spanish speaking	1.4
Other non-white	1.1
Other	<u>5.9</u>
	100.0%

enforcers, with a considerable proportion uncertain (Table III-8).

- virtually devoid of physical handicap or illness (Table III-9).
- very moderate tobacco users, and drinkers to a certain extent (Table III-10).
- not drug users (Table III-11).
- only slightly psychologically disordered (Table III-12).
- more "bad guy" than "good guy" although the single largest category was "mixed" and there was a substantial proportion that could not be coded (Table III-13).
- perceived as mostly successful (50.3 per cent) although close to a third could not be coded (Table III-14).
- in over 50 per cent of the cases, not deserving of punishment, but when they were, one-third of them escaped without any form of punishment while almost another third (29.4 per cent) ended up being killed (Table III-15).
- losers almost twice as often as winners, while close to a third neither won nor lost (Table III-16).

TABLE III-8

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY OCCUPATION

Housewife	2.4%
Law Enforcement (Public)	13.8
Law Enforcement (Private)	2.7
Military	5.7
Legal - Boss	14.1
Legal - Underling	5.9
Illegal - Boss	5.9
Illegal - Underling	11.1
Unemployed	4.6
Other	3.2
Uncertain	<u>18.4</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-9

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS FOR PHYSICAL HANDICAP AND ILLNESS

	<u>Physical Handicap</u>	<u>Physical Illness</u>
No evidence	98.1%	99.2%
To some degree	1.4	0.8
Impairment	<u>0.5</u>	<u>-</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-10

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY TOBACCO AND ALCOHOL USE

	<u>Tobacco Use</u>	<u>Alcohol Use</u>
No evidence of use	88.4%	75.1%
Moderate use	11.1	23.5
Heavy use	<u>0.5</u>	<u>1.4</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-11

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY PRESCRIPTION AND ILLEGAL DRUG USE

	<u>Prescription Drugs</u>	<u>Illegal Drugs</u>
No evidence of use	98.6%	97.3%
Moderate use	1.1	1.9
Heavy use	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.8</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-12

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY PSYCHOLOGICAL DISORDER

No evidence	92.7%
Moderate	3.2
Severe but not hospitalized	4.1
Severe (institutionalized)	<u>-</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-13
DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY ROLE TYPE

Protagonist	20.0%
Mixed	34.3
Antagonist	26.2
Cannot code	<u>19.5</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-14
DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY CHARACTER IMAGE

Total Success	12.2%
Not quite total success	17.8
Qualified success	20.3
Qualified failure	6.5
Unqualified failure	10.5
Cannot code	<u>32.7</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-15

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY PUNISHMENT

Punishment not appropriate	52.2%
Appropriate but no punishment	15.9
Indirect punishment (retribution by "forces" within the plot)	9.7
Unclear	1.1
Physical	4.1
Death	14.7
Imprisonment (no indication of term)	1.9
Long-term imprisonment	0.5
Reprimand	0.3
Withdrawal of privileges	<u>0.3</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-16

DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERS BY FINAL OUTCOME

Clear winner	17.8%
Qualified winner	6.8
Neither gain nor loss	32.4
Qualified loser	2.4
Clear loser	<u>40.5</u>
	100.0%

2. Comparison of Leading and Non-Leading Characters

The characters representing the principle types of the films and those who are basically only minor contributors to various incidents and events in the flow of the plot differ in some interesting respects. Their distribution according to sex is not one of those interesting differences, however, the high percentages of males in each simply being a reflection of the overall predominance of males (Table III-17).

The non-leading characters are somewhat younger than the leading characters, concentrated more in the adult age range (19-40) and less in the middle age range (41-64) (Table III-18).

Considering characters who could be coded as to marital status, there were no major differences between leading and non-leading characters (Table III-19). It should be noted, however, that only about 20 per cent of the non-leading characters could be so coded, the comparable figure for leading characters being about 52 per cent.³

A similar difference arose when specifying income level but it was not quite as great: 80.8 per cent of leading characters could be so coded while only 67.7 per cent of non-leading ones could be. Examining only those characters who could be coded as to income, leading characters tended to be more upper class, while the non-leading ones were spread more widely over the categories, although a majority were still white collar or above (Table III-20).

There are differences for racial groups, with the leading characters having a higher percentage of whites and non-leading higher percentages of "other non-white" and "other" (Table III-21).

TABLE III-17
SEX OF CHARACTERS BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Male	78.8%	84.9%
Female	<u>21.2</u>	<u>15.1</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-18
AGE OF CHARACTERS BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Child (to 11)	2.2%	0.6%
Adolescent (12-18)	0.5	2.2
Adult (19-40)	51.1	66.1
Middle age (41-64)	40.2	30.6
Old (65 and over)	<u>6.0</u>	<u>0.6</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-19

MARITAL STATUS BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Single	49.0%	50.0%
Common law relationships	5.2	--
Various stages of marriage	<u>45.8</u>	<u>50.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-20

INCOME LEVEL BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Upper	58.1%	15.1%
White Collar	30.9	48.4
Blue Collar	6.7	20.6
Lower	2.0	11.9
Student	<u>2.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-21

RACIAL GROUP BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
White North Americans	59.2%	40.3%
White non-North Americans	27.2	29.0
Black	3.3	2.2
Other non-White	8.7	18.3
Other	<u>1.6</u>	<u>10.2</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

As to occupations, the only notable differences (and they are slight) are the higher percentage of law enforcers among leading characters and of "illegals" among non-leading ones (Table III-22).

The leading characters exhibited a slightly greater degree of psychological disorder (Table III-23), and a greater use of tobacco (Table III-24) and alcohol (Table III-25).

An examination of Table III-26 reveals that the leading characters were almost evenly split on the role type categories, but were slightly more "good guy" than "bad guy." The just over 60 per cent of non-leading characters who could be coded on this variable tended to fall mainly into the "mixed" category, but were more "bad guy" than "good guy."

"Character image" is another variable that seems to fall victim to lack of information about non-leading characters: 53.2 per cent of them could not be coded for it, while only 12 per cent of leading characters could not. Of the characters that could be coded, over half of the leading characters had good images while non-leading were concentrated in the "mixed" category, but were slightly more "good" than "bad" (Table III-27).

And when it comes to considering punishable behaviour, slightly under 50 per cent of leading and slightly over 50 per cent of non-leading characters did not exhibit such behaviour. For characters who did exhibit punishable behaviour, however, leading characters escaped punishment at a rate almost twice that of non-leading characters (Table III-28). In addition, non-leading characters experienced more physical punishment and death while leading ones experienced greater retribution

TABLE III-22
OCCUPATION BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
General	31.3%	33.1%
Law Enforcement	23.8	16.2
Illegal	16.9	25.4
Extra-legal	6.9	7.7
Military	7.5	6.3
Housewife	4.4	1.4
Other	3.1	4.9
Unemployed	<u>6.3</u>	<u>4.9</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-23
PSYCHOLOGICAL DISORDER BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
No evidence of disorder	91.3%	94.1%
Moderate disorder	3.3	3.2
Severe disorder but not hospitalized	<u>5.4</u>	<u>2.7</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-24

TOBACCO USE BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
No evidence of use	82.6%	94.1%
Moderate use	16.8	5.4
Heavy use	<u>0.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-25

ALCOHOL USE BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
No evidence of use	63.6%	86.6%
Moderate use	34.2	12.9
Heavy use	<u>2.2</u>	<u>0.5</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-26

ROLE TYPE BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Protagonist	32.6%	12.3%
Mixed	37.5	50.9
Antagonist	<u>29.9</u>	<u>36.8</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-27
CHARACTER IMAGE BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Good	52.5%	29.9%
Mixed	35.8	47.1
Bad	<u>11.7</u>	<u>23.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-28
PUNISHMENT BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Appropriate but no punishment	41.9%	23.8%
Retribution via the plot	23.7	16.7
Physical method	3.2	14.3
Death	20.4	39.3
Imprisonment	9.7	--
Admonitions or warnings	--	2.4
Unclear punishment	<u>1.1</u>	<u>3.6</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

via the plot and imprisonment.

As to final outcome, leading characters were almost evenly divided between winners and losers, but non-leading characters were much more likely to be losers or remain unchanged, than to be winners (Table III-29).

TABLE III-29
FINAL OUTCOME BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Winner	39.7%	9.7%
Neither gain nor loss	22.8	41.9
Loser	<u>37.5</u>	<u>48.4</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

3. Comparison of Males and Females

Another major variable on which to compare the nature of the characters is "sex." As Table III-30 indicates, females were composed of a higher proportion of leading characters than were males, but the difference between the sexes in this regard is only very slight. More noteworthy is the relative youth of the females in comparison to the males (Table III-31). Females had a marked tendency to be located in the 19-40 age range. The majority of the males were in this range as well, but they were represented in the middle age category (41-64) to a much greater extent than the females.

As regards marital status, the major difference between males and females was the high percentage of males whose marital status could not be specified (73.7 per cent) as compared to the females (28.4 per cent). For those characters for whom marital status could be specified, however, there was very little difference between the sexes (Table III-32). Males and females also differed little in terms of racial group membership, although women tended to be even more overwhelmingly white than males (83.6 per cent vs. 76.5 per cent) and males had a slightly higher proportion of "other non-white" (Table III-33).

Roughly one quarter of the numbers of both males and females could not be specified as to income level. For those who could, there were no large differences (Table III-34).

As might be expected, females had a greater proportion of housewives within their ranks, although it is notable that the percentage for females is very low in comparison to the actual situation of women in society (Table III-35).⁴ Women

TABLE III-30

STATUS OF CHARACTERS BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Leading	47.9%	58.2%
Non-leading	<u>52.1</u>	<u>41.8</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-31

AGE OF CHARACTERS BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Child (to 11)	1.3%	1.5%
Adolescent (12-18)	1.3	1.5
Adult (19-40)	55.2	73.1
Middle age (41-64)	38.7	20.9
Old (65 and over)	<u>3.4</u>	<u>3.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-32

MARITAL STATUS BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Single	50.0%	47.9%
Common law relationships	2.4	6.3
Various stages of marriage	<u>47.6</u>	<u>45.8</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-33

RACIAL GROUP BY SEX

	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
White North Americans	48.8%	53.7%
White non-North Americans	27.7	29.9
Black	2.6	3.0
Other non-White	14.5	9.0
Other	<u>6.3</u>	<u>4.5</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-34

INCOME LEVEL BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Upper	39.9%	32.7%
White collar	38.1	42.3
Blue collar	13.5	11.5
Lower	5.8	9.6
Student	<u>2.7</u>	<u>3.8</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-35

OCCUPATION BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
General	29.6%	44.9%
Law Enforcement	22.9	6.1
Illegal	22.9	10.2
Extra-legal	7.9	9.1
Military	8.3	0.0
Housewife	0.4	16.3
Other	2.4	12.2
Unemployed	<u>5.5</u>	<u>6.1</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

were also more prominent in "general" occupations (but predominantly as underlings rather than bosses) and in "other" occupations. Men tended to be more prevalent in military, extra-legal, law enforcement and illegal occupations.

There were no substantial differences for the sexes for the use of drugs (either prescription or illegal), or the use of tobacco, or for the incidence of psychological disorder. Women did tend to be somewhat greater consumers of alcohol, however (Table III-36).

When the roughly 20 per cent of each group that could not be coded as to role type were excluded, some substantial differences emerged between the sexes in terms of their place among the forces of good and evil (Table III-37). Women were protagonists to a greater extent than men were, but men were even more markedly antagonists than women were. The results were similar for the somewhat related variable, "character image" (Table III-38). Character image was a much more difficult phenomenon to identify given that almost one-third of male and over two-thirds of female characters could not be coded for it. Of those who could be coded, females had a much more positive image while males had a more negative one; however, the negative image of the males was not as distinctive as the positive image of the females.

When it comes to punishment, 73.1 per cent of the females did not engage in behaviour that was deserving of punishment while only 47.5 per cent of the males were in a similar position. And when punishment was appropriate, 55.6 per cent of the females escaped punishment while only 30.8 per cent of the males did. When punishment is meted out, however, it is almost as

TABLE III-36

ALCOHOL USE BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
No evidence of use	78.9%	58.2%
Moderate use	20.1	38.8
Heavy use	<u>1.0</u>	<u>3.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-37

ROLE TYPE BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Protagonist	21.8%	38.2%
Mixed	39.9	54.5
Antagonist	<u>38.3</u>	<u>7.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-38

CHARACTER IMAGE BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Good	38.7%	71.1%
Mixed	42.6	26.7
Bad	<u>18.6</u>	<u>2.2</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

likely to come as some form of natural retribution via the plot as it is by death for males, but most likely as death for females (Table III-39).

Finally, in terms of the final outcome for male and female characters, males were more often losers while females were more often winners (Table III-40).

TABLE III-39
PUNISHMENT BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Appropriate but no punishment	30.8%	55.6%
Retribution via the plot	22.0	5.6
Physical method	8.8	5.6
Death	29.6	27.8
Imprisonment	5.0	5.6
Admonitions or warnings	1.3	--
Unclear Punishment	<u>2.5</u>	<u>--</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-40
FINAL OUTCOME BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Winner	21.1%	40.3%
Neither gain nor loss	33.7	26.9
Loser	<u>45.2</u>	<u>32.8</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

4. Comparison of Protagonists, Antagonists and "Mixed" Role Types

Another major variable on which the characters will be compared is "role type." The nature of "good guys" and "bad guys" is obviously an important determinant of the viewer's perception of "the preferred structure traits, values and powers," as Gerbner observed.⁵

The greater tendency for "protagonists" to be leading characters and for "mixed" and "antagonists" to be non-leading characters is demonstrated in Table III-41.

While males dominated all role types, they were more markedly present as "antagonists" (Table III-42).

"Protagonists" were younger than either "mixed" or "antagonists" (Table III-43), and were also more often single (Table III-44).⁶

Protagonists had the lowest rate of "non-codeability" for income at 14.9 per cent, while antagonists had the highest (33.0 per cent), with "mixed" in between at 29.7 per cent. The results for the codeable characters revealed that while all role types tend to be upper or white collar, protagonists were more white collar and antagonists more upper, with mixed between them in both instances (Table III-45).

And while there were no major differences for racial group membership among role types (Table III-46), both "protagonists" and "antagonists" located a large proportion of their numbers in law enforcement occupations, with "antagonists" also occupying large percentages of illegal occupations (Table III-47).

"Antagonists" (and to a lesser extent "mixed") exhibited a greater incidence of psychological disorder (Table III-48).

TABLE III-41
STATUS BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
Leading	81.1%	54.3%	56.7%
Non-Leading	<u>18.9</u>	<u>45.7</u>	<u>43.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-42
SEX BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
Male	71.6%	76.4%	95.9%
Female	<u>28.4</u>	<u>23.6</u>	<u>4.1</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-43
AGE BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
Child (to 11)	4.1%	-	1.0%
Adolescent (12-18)	1.4	0.8%	-
Adult (19-40)	63.5	50.4	50.0
Middle age (41-65)	28.4	44.1	44.8
Old (65 and over)	<u>2.7</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>4.2</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-44

MARITAL STATUS BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
Single	64.6%	39.3%	41.7%
Common law relationship	6.3	3.6	--
Various stages of marriage	<u>29.2</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>58.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-45

INCOME LEVEL BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
Upper	34.9%	44.1%	53.8%
White Collar	47.6	40.2	29.2
Blue Collar	7.9	6.9	9.2
Lower	4.8	7.8	4.6
Student	<u>4.8</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>3.1</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-46

RACIAL GROUP BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
White North American	51.4%	55.1%	50.5%
White Non-North American	29.7	27.6	29.9
Black	5.4	1.6	1.0
Other Non-White	12.2	11.0	13.4
Other	<u>1.4</u>	<u>4.7</u>	<u>5.2</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-47
OCCUPATION BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
General	32.8%	41.5%	13.3%
Law enforcement	32.8	16.0	22.2
Illegal	3.1	14.2	46.7
Extra-legal	9.4	8.5	4.4
Military	--	10.4	7.8
Housewife	4.7	4.7	1.1
Other	6.3	1.9	1.1
Unemployed	<u>10.9</u>	<u>2.8</u>	<u>3.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-48
PSYCHOLOGICAL DISORDER BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
No evidence	98.6%	92.1%	87.6%
Moderate	1.4	3.9	3.1
Severe but not hospitalized	<u>--</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>9.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

And there was little difference in tobacco use (Table III-49), but "protagonists" and "mixed" were more prone to use alcohol (Table III-50).

In examining the distribution of punishment some striking differences emerged (Table III-51). A most significant 94.6 per cent of all "protagonists" never exhibited behaviour that would warrant punishment. Of the four who did, three escaped punishment altogether. Such was not the case for "antagonists": only 8.2 per cent did not warrant punishment, and of those who deserved it, only 22.5 per cent escaped it. The largest proportions of punishment involved death and retribution via the plot.

The character images for the role types exhibited quite a systematic linear correlation: "protagonists" had the highest percentage of "good" images and the lowest percentage of "mixed" and "bad images (Table III-52). Antagonists had exactly the opposite distribution, while "mixed role" characters consistently fell between the "protagonists" and "antagonists." This phenomenon is even more pronounced for "final outcome" (Table III-53).

TABLE III-49
TOBACCO USE BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
No evidence of use	89.2%	81.9%	89.7%
Moderate use	10.8	16.5	10.3
Heavy use	<u>--</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>--</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-50
ALCOHOL USE BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
No evidence of use	63.5%	59.8%	88.7%
Moderate use	36.5	37.8	10.3
Heavy use	<u>--</u>	<u>2.4</u>	<u>1.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-51

PUNISHMENT BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
Appropriate but no punishment	75.0%	52.2%	22.5%
Indirect punishment (retribution by "forces" within the plot)	--	13.4	24.7
Physical	--	9.0	10.1
Death	--	20.9	32.6
Imprisonment	--	3.0	7.9
Reprimand	--	1.5	--
Unclear punishment	<u>25.0</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>2.2</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-52

CHARACTER IMAGE BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
Good	82.6%	44.7%	10.7%
Mixed	15.9	39.4	62.7
Bad	<u>1.4</u>	<u>16.0</u>	<u>26.7</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-53

FINAL OUTCOME BY ROLE TYPE

	<u>Protagonist</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonist</u>
Winner	60.8%	32.3%	5.2%
Neither loss nor gain	20.3	30.7	30.9
Loser	<u>18.9</u>	<u>37.0</u>	<u>63.9</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

5. Comparison of the Sexes for Leading and Non-Leading Characters

It was felt that the status of a character might be related to or influence the way in which the sexes were portrayed. Table III-54 demonstrates, for example, that the age differential between males and females was greater among leading characters.

While a "non-codeability" rate of 88.0 per cent on marital status for non-leading males prevented a comparison on that variable, the rate of one third "non-codeability" for income for the same group allowed a comparison to be made on income (Table III-55). The leading males tended to be more upper class while the non-leading females were more heavily concentrated in the white collar level and had a relatively large percentage located in "lower" as well. Non-leading males were significantly blue collar, and "lower" to a lesser extent.

There was also a greater tendency for non-leading males to be non-white and leading males to be white, while both leading and non-leading females were predominantly white (Table III-56).

Housewives constituted a larger percentage of leading females than they did of non-leading ones (Table III-57). In addition, leading males were more frequently law enforcers than were non-leading males. And both non-leading males and females had proportionately greater of their numbers in the illegal occupations than did the leading males.

Non-leading females tended to have a greater incidence of psychological disorder (Table III-58).

The pattern of heavily male "antagonists" and female

TABLE III-54

AGE BY SEX AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Child (to 8)	2.8%	--	--	3.6%
Adolescent (9-18)	0.7	--	2.0%	3.6
Adult (19-40)	44.1	76.9%	64.8	67.9
Middle Age (41-64)	45.5	20.5	32.2	21.4
Old (65 and over)	<u>6.9</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>3.6</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-55

INCOME LEVEL BY SEX AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Upper	61.9%	45.2%	15.2%	14.3%
White Collar	29.7	35.5	47.6	52.4
Blue Collar	5.1	12.9	22.9	9.5
Lower	1.7	3.2	10.5	19.0
Student	<u>1.7</u>	<u>3.2</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>4.8</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-56

RACIAL GROUP BY SEX AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
White North Americans	60.0%	56.4%	38.6%	50.0%
White non-North Americans	26.9	28.2	28.5	32.1
Black	2.8	5.1	2.5	--
Other non-White	9.0	7.7	19.6	10.7
Other	<u>1.4</u>	<u>2.6</u>	<u>10.8</u>	<u>7.1</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-57

OCCUPATION BY SEX AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
General	27.5%	48.3%	32.0%	40.0%
Housewife	0.8	20.7	--	10.0
Law Enforcement	27.5	6.9	18.0	5.0
Military	9.2	--	7.4	--
Extra-legal	7.6	3.4	8.2	5.0
Illegal	19.8	3.4	26.2	20.0
Unemployed	6.1	6.9	4.2	0.7
Other	<u>1.5</u>	<u>10.3</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>15.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-58

PSYCHOLOGICAL DISORDER BY SEX AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
No evidence of disorder	91.0%	92.3%	95.6%	85.7%
Moderate disorder	3.4	2.6	2.5	7.1
Severe disorder but not institutionalized	<u>5.5</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>7.1</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

"protagonists" for leading characters was not present for non-leading ones (Table III-59). Non-leading males were more proportionately "antagonists," but the females tended to be "mixed" rather than "protagonists."

A similar tendency was evident for "character image" (Table III-60). While leading females had a much better image than males of the same character status, non-leading males and females were more similar. As a consequence of this and the even more pronounced bad image of non-leading males, the balance of "mixed" image swung to the females.

This tendency also existed for "final outcome" (Table III-61). While leading females are much greater winners than leading males there is virtually no differences for the sexes for non-leading characters. As a consequence, the non-leading females have a higher proportion of "neither gain nor loss" than the males, a relationship which is reversed for the leading characters.

Finally, punishment was also dealt with differently for the sexes for the two statuses (Table III-62). Females tended to have a greater incidence of non-punishable behaviour for both statuses but the rates were higher for both males and females among the non-leading. Females also escaped punishment more often than males for both leading and non-leading characters, but the difference was greater (and at a higher level) for the leading characters. When punishment was meted out, it was more likely to come as death for the non-leading characters with females as more likely candidates than males—the reverse of the situation for leading characters.

TABLE III-59
ROLE BY SEX AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Protagonist	29.0%	46.2%	11.2%	18.8%
Mixed	35.2	46.2	46.9	75.0
Antagonist	<u>35.9</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>41.8</u>	<u>6.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-60
CHARACTER IMAGE BY SEX AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Good	33.1%	64.1%	10.1%	7.1%
Mixed	26.9	7.7	39.9	53.6
Bad	<u>40.0</u>	<u>28.2</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>39.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-61

FINAL OUTCOME BY SEX AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Winner	33.1%	64.1%	39.9%	53.6%
Neither loss nor gain	26.9	7.7	10.1	7.1
Loser	<u>40.0</u>	<u>28.2</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>39.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-62

PUNISHMENT BY SEX AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
Appropriate but no punishment	39.0%	63.6%	22.1%	42.9%
Retribution via the plot	25.6	9.1	18.2	--
Physical method	3.7	--	14.3	14.3
Death	20.7	18.2	39.0	42.9
Imprisonment	9.8	9.1	--	--
Admonition or warnings	--	--	2.6	--
Unclear punishment	<u>1.2</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>3.9</u>	<u>--</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

6. Comparison of Role Types for Leading and Non-Leading Characters

Character status was also felt to have some relevance for the way role type would be depicted. Table III-63 shows that the percentage of males in role type categories increases as one moves across from protagonist to antagonist, but that the level of "maleness" for the non-leading characters is higher across the board.

The high "non-codeability" rate of non-leading characters on marital status precluded the comparison of the role types between statuses on that variable. While income exhibited some "non-codeability," it was not sufficient to preclude comparison. Table III-64 presents this comparison and points out that antagonists are the most "upper" of the role types for leading characters, while "mixed" are for non-leading (at a much lower level, however). Antagonists among non-leading also tend to be more blue collar and lower than are their leading counterparts. There is also a slight tendency in this direction for protagonists.

An interesting contrast emerges in the area of age (Table III-65). While the protagonists among leading characters tend to be younger than the antagonists, the relationship is reversed for non-leading characters: antagonists are younger and protagonists are older.

There are also great differences in the distribution among racial groups (Table III-66). All three role categories for leading characters have high percentages of whites (especially the antagonists at 90.9 per cent). The only role type for non-leading characters to come close to these per-

TABLE III-63

SEX BY ROLE TYPE AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>	<u>Protagonists</u> <u>Mixed</u> <u>Antagonists</u>
Male	70.0%	73.9%	94.5%	78.6% 79.3% 97.6%
Female	30.0%	26.1%	5.5%	21.4% 20.7% 2.4%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

TABLE III-64

INCOME LEVEL BY ROLE TYPE AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>	
	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>	<u>Protagonists</u> <u>Mixed</u> <u>Antagonists</u>
Upper	40.0%	62.5%	74.4%	15.4% 21.7% 13.6%
White Collar	44.0%	26.8%	20.9%	61.5% 56.5% 45.5%
Blue Collar	8.0%	7.1%	4.7%	7.7% 6.5% 18.2%
Lower	2.0%	3.6%	--	15.4% 7.4% 13.6%
Student	6.0%	--	--	-- 1.2% 9.1%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0% 100.0% 100.0%

TABLE III-65

AGE BY ROLE TYPE AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>		
	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u> <u>Antagonists</u>
Child (to 11)	5.0%	--	1.8%	--	--
Adolescent (12-18)	1.7	--	--	--	1.7%
Adult (19-40)	66.7	46.4%	40.0	50.0%	55.2 63.4%
Middle Age (41-64)	23.3	46.4	50.9	50.0	41.4 36.6
Old (65 and over)	3.3	7.2	7.3	--	1.7 --
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0% 100.0%

TABLE III-66

RACIAL GROUP BY ROLE TYPE AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>		<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>		
	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u> <u>Antagonists</u>
White North Americans	58.3%	59.4%	60.0%	21.4%	50.0% 38.1%
White non-North Americans	26.7	24.6	30.9	42.9	31.0 28.6
Black	6.7	2.9	--	--	-- 2.4
Other non-White	8.3	8.7	9.1	28.6	13.8 19.0
Other	--	4.3	--	7.1	5.2 11.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0% 100.0%

centages is "mixed," with non-leading antagonists almost 25 per cent below the percentage of leading ones. Also notable is the very high percentage of "other non-whites" among non-leading protagonists.

As to occupations, non-leading protagonists are much more prominent as law enforcers than are their "leading" counterparts (Table III-67). This is also the case for non-leading antagonists in illegal occupations. There is also an inordinately high percentage of leading protagonists who are unemployed.

In examining psychological disorders, leading antagonists are clearly the most heavily afflicted (Table III-68).

The presentation of the "character image" of leading characters tended to create greater differences between protagonists and antagonists than was the case for non-leading characters (Table III-69). This was mainly the result of the more positive image of leading protagonists. The image of "mixed" role types for leading characters also tended to be more positive.

A similar sharpening of differences between protagonists and antagonists for leading characters was evident for "final outcome" (Table III-70).

And as to punishment, the differences in severity of treatment between role types were greater for non-leading than leading characters (Table III-71). No non-leading protagonists exhibited behaviour that warranted punishment. Even though a higher percentage of non-leading than leading antagonists were in a similar situation, when punishment was appropriate, non-leading antagonists were less likely to escape punishment than

TABLE III-67
OCCUPATION BY ROLE TYPE AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>			<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>		
	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>
General	32.7%	44.6%	15.4%	33.3%	38.0%	10.5%
Law enforcement	28.8	16.1	26.9	50.0	16.0	15.8
Illegal	1.9	12.5	36.5	8.3	16.0	60.5
Extra-legal	11.5	3.6	5.8	--	14.0	2.6
Military	--	10.7	11.5	--	14.0	2.6
Housewife	3.8	7.1	1.9	8.3	2.0	--
Other	7.7	1.8	--	--	2.0	2.6
Unemployed	<u>13.5</u>	<u>3.6</u>	<u>5.8</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>2.0</u>	<u>5.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-68

PSYCHOLOGICAL DISORDER BY ROLE TYPE AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>			<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>		
	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>
No evidence of disorder	98.3%	94.2%	80.0%	100.0%	89.7%	97.5%
Moderate disorder	1.7	2.9	5.5	--	5.2	--
Severe disorder but not institutionalized	--	2.9	14.5	--	5.2	2.4
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-69

CHARACTER IMAGE BY ROLE TYPE AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>			<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>		
	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>
Good	85.7%	54.4%	12.2%	69.2%	29.7%	7.7%
Mixed	12.5	36.8	61.2	30.8	43.2	65.4
Bad	1.8	8.8	26.5	--	27.0	26.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-70
FINAL OUTCOME BY ROLE TYPE AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>			<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>		
	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>
Winner	65.0%	33.3%	5.5%	42.9%	17.2%	4.8%
Neither gain nor loss	18.3	21.7	29.1	28.6	41.4	33.3
Loser	16.7	33.3	65.5	28.6	41.4	61.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-71
PUNISHMENT BY ROLE TYPE AND CHARACTER STATUS

	<u>Leading Characters</u>			<u>Non-Leading Characters</u>		
	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Mixed</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>
Appropriate but no punishment	75.0%	59.5%	26.9%	--	43.3%	16.2%
Retribution via the plot	--	18.9	28.8	--	6.7	18.9
Physical method	--	2.7	3.8	--	16.7	18.9
Death	--	13.5	26.9	--	30.0	40.5
Imprisonment	--	5.4	13.5	--	--	--
Admonition and warnings	--	--	--	--	3.3	--
Unclear punishment	25.0	--	--	--	--	5.4
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	--	100.0%	100.0%

were leading ones. In addition, the non-leading antagonists were more likely to be punished physically or put to death than their leading counterparts. A somewhat similar situation held for the non-leading "mixed" when compared to the leading variety.

7. Comparison of Characters for Production Sources, Popularity Levels and Film Types

An examination of the differences in characters for Canadian and non-Canadian, popular and not-so-popular, and action and non-action films was also of interest. Table III-72 demonstrates that non-Canadian, popular and action films all had larger proportions of non-leading than leading characters. In addition, the difference in the distribution for the two status categories is most pronounced for film type.

Males dominated both categories of all three variables (Table III-73). The largest difference between percentages of males (and of females as well, of course) occurred between popular and not-so-popular films, although the lowest percentage of males and highest percentage of females appeared in non-Canadian ones.

Adults and middle-aged characters were present in overwhelming proportions in both categories for all three variables as well, with adults more prominent than the middle age group (Table III-74). Canadian, not-so-popular and action films were even more heavily "adult" than were non-Canadian, popular and non-action films.

The percentage of characters for whom marital status could not be specified was high for each category of all variables, ranging from 41.9 per cent of all characters in Canadian films to 75.2 per cent in not-so-popular films. In examining those characters who could be specified, Canadian and not-so-popular films had a majority of married characters, while non-Canadian and popular ones had a slight majority of single ones (Table III-75). Action and non-action films were almost identical in their distributions and had close to a 50-50 split between

TABLE III-72

STATUS OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCE, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Level</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Leading	62.8%	48.0%	45.7%	57.6%	39.3%	61.5%
Non-Leading	37.2	52.0	54.3	42.4	60.7	38.5
Conflictants/Violents	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-73

SEX OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Level</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Male	82.6%	76.7%	78.8%	88.0%	82.7%	81.0%
	<u>17.4</u>	<u>23.3</u>	<u>21.2</u>	<u>12.0</u>	<u>17.3</u>	<u>19.0</u>
Female	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-74

AGE OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Level</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Child (to 11)	4.7%	0.9%	1.6%	0.8%	1.0%	1.7%
Adolescent (12-18)	2.3	1.2	1.6	0.8	1.6	1.2
Adult (19-40)	65.1	57.6	56.0	63.6	64.4	62.0
Middle Age (41-64)	25.6	36.8	39.1	28.1	31.9	39.3
Old (65 and over)	2.3	3.4	1.6	6.6	1.0	5.8
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

143

TABLE III-75

MARITAL STATUS OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Level</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Single	36.0%	52.3%	46.5%	58.1%	49.2%	49.3%
Common law relationships	--	4.7	3.0	6.5	3.2	4.3
Various stages of marriage	64.0	43.0	50.5	35.5	47.6	46.4
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

marrieds and singles.

Approximately one quarter of all characters for each category could not be coded for income with the exception of Canadian films at 41.9 per cent. Considering only those characters who could be coded for income, non-Canadian films had a much greater percentage of upper income characters than did Canadian films, while the latter tended to have relatively larger proportions of blue collar and lower income ones (Table III-76). The differences were less pronounced for film type in this regard and least pronounced for popularity level.

Canadian, popular and non-action films all had greater proportions of white characters than did their counterparts (Table III-77). The non-whites are noticeably located in the not-so-popular films.

Between 15.1 percent (popular films) and 27.9 per cent (Canadian films) of the characters could not be coded for occupation. When considering those who could be so coded, Canadian and not-so-popular films had a greater proportion of law enforcers than did non-Canadian and popular films (action and non-action being about even) (Table III-78). For "illegals," however, non-Canadian films and action films had greater proportions than their counterparts, while popular and not-so-popular differed little. This means that the ratio of law enforcers to illegals is greater in Canadian, not-so-popular and non-action films, and in comparing the ratios within each variable, the most pronounced difference exists between Canadian and non-Canadian films.

In dealing with psychological well-being, and the use of

TABLE III-76
INCOME LEVEL OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Level</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Upper	8.0%	41.6%	42.2%	31.6%	29.5%	48.8%
White Collar	48.0	38.0	37.2	42.1	44.5	32.6
Blue Collar	28.0	11.6	11.7	15.8	15.1	10.9
Lower	12.0	6.0	4.4	10.5	6.8	6.2
Student	4.0	2.8	4.4	--	4.1	1.6
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-77
RACIAL GROUP OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Level</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
White North American	65.1%	47.7%	55.1%	39.2%	41.3%	59.2%
White non-North American	25.6	28.4	34.7	15.2	30.6	25.3
Black	4.7	2.4	1.2	5.6	2.6	2.9
Other non-white	4.7	14.7	6.5	27.2	15.3	11.5
Other	--	6.7	2.4	12.8	10.2	1.1
	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-78

OCCUPATION OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Level</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
General	29.0%	32.5%	34.6%	26.6%	27.7%	36.7%
Law Enforcement	29.0	19.2	16.3	28.7	20.0	20.4
Illegal	12.9	21.8	20.2	22.3	25.8	15.6
Extra-legal	3.2	7.7	9.1	3.2	12.9	1.4
Military	--	7.7	3.4	14.9	3.2	10.9
Housewife	9.7	2.2	3.4	2.1	1.3	4.8
Other	6.5	3.7	5.8	--	2.6	5.4
Unemployed	9.7	5.2	7.2	2.1	6.5	4.8
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

tobacco and alcohol, characters in Canadian films are more psychologically disordered but smoke and drink less than do characters in non-Canadian films; characters in popular films are more pronounced in their behaviour for all three aspects than are those in not-so-popular films; and characters in action films are more psychologically disordered than those in non-action films but differ little in terms of tobacco and alcohol use. (Tables III-79, III-80 and III-81).

Roughly 20 per cent of the characters for both categories of production source and of popularity level could not be coded for role type. This percentage rose to 26.5 per cent for action films and fell to 11.5 per cent for non-action films. Examining the results for the ones who could be coded reveals that the strongest polarization of "good guys" and "bad guys" takes place in Canadian films (Table III-82). The "mixed" category is relatively large in all other situations, the only other case in which the percentage of protagonists and/or antagonists is greater than that for "mixed" being not-so-popular films.

There was a somewhat higher (approximately one-third) "non-codeability" rate for "character image," with the exception of Canadian films (23.3 per cent). For the characters who could be coded, there was a considerably higher rate of good images than bad images, and of mixed categories equal to or larger than one-third, for all classifications except Canadian films (Table III-83). This is interesting given the greater prominence of protagonists in Canadian films as just noted above. Also noteworthy is the comparatively large percentage of bad-image characters in non-action films.

TABLE III-79

PSYCHOLOGICAL DISORDER FOR CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Level</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
No evidence of disorder	88.4%	93.3%	90.6%	96.8%	88.8%	97.1%
Moderate disorder	7.0	2.8	3.7	2.4	3.6	2.9
Severe but not hospitalized	<u>4.7</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>--</u>
	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-80

TOBACCO USE FOR CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Sources</u>		<u>Popularity Levels</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
No evidence of use	97.7%	87.2%	86.9%	91.2%	88.8%	87.9%
Moderate use	2.3	12.2	12.2	8.8	10.7	11.5
Heavy use	<u>--</u>	<u>0.6</u>	<u>0.8</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>0.6</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-81
ALCOHOL USE FOR CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Sources</u>		<u>Popularity Levels</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
No evidence of use	95.3%	72.5%	70.2%	84.8%	77.6%	72.4%
Moderate use	4.7	26.0	27.8	15.2	21.4	25.9
Heavy use	--	1.5	2.0	--	1.0	1.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-82
ROLE TYPE OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Sources</u>		<u>Popularity Levels</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Protagonist	50.0%	21.6%	20.4%	33.3%	28.5%	21.4%
Mixed	11.8	46.6	48.5	31.4	36.1	48.7
Antagonist	38.2	31.8	20.5	35.3	35.4	29.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-83

CHARACTER IMAGE OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Levels</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Good	39.4%	45.4%	46.5%	40.5%	43.8%	45.5%
Mixed	27.3	41.7	38.2	43.0	46.1	33.1
Bad	33.3	13.0	15.3	16.5	10.2	21.5
	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%

The rate of non-punishable behaviour exhibited in the films hovered around 50 per cent for all classifications, except the Canadian films which had a very high 74.4 per cent. When punishment was appropriate, however, it was most often escaped in non-action films and least often escaped in Canadian and action films (Table III-84). Retribution via the plot was a fairly prevalent method of punishment in non-Canadian, both popular and not-so-popular, and action films. Death was the most prevalent method in non-Canadian, popular and action films (especially so in the latter). The use of imprisonment to any great extent was only evident in Canadian films.

And finally, with regard to "final outcome," losers and those whose neither gained nor lost were generally more evident than were winners (Table III-85). The characters in Canadian, popular and non-action films tended to be somewhat more winners than the characters in their corresponding classifications, while losers were more evident in non-Canadian (but only slightly so), popular, and most noticeably in action films.

TABLE III-84

PUNISHMENT OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Levels</u>		<u>Film Type</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Appropriate but no punishment	18.2%	34.3%	30.8%	38.3%	18.3%	50.0%
Retribution via the plot	9.1	21.1	20.5	20.0	24.7	15.5
Physical method	9.4	8.4	8.5	8.3	5.4	11.9
Death	18.2	30.1	35.9	16.7	48.4	8.3
Imprisonment	45.5	2.4	1.7	11.7	1.1	9.5
Admonitions or warnings	--	1.2	1.7	--	2.2	--
Unclear punishment	--	2.4	0.9	5.0	--	4.8
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-85
FINAL OUTCOME OF CHARACTERS FOR PRODUCTION SOURCES, POPULARITY LEVELS AND FILM TYPES

	<u>Production Source</u>		<u>Popularity Level</u>		<u>Film Types</u>	
	<u>Canada</u>	<u>Non-Canadian</u>	<u>Popular</u>	<u>Not-So-Popular</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Non-Action</u>
Winner	25.7%	16.3%	27.3%	19.2%	20.9%	28.7%
Neither gain nor loss	31.5	39.5	26.5	44.0	21.9	44.3
Loser	<u>42.8</u>	<u>44.2</u>	<u>46.1</u>	<u>36.8</u>	<u>57.1</u>	<u>27.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

8. Traits Scores

The characters were coded for traits on a list of 42 polar scales. Of the 370 characters, only 247 were coded for these scales since a large number of non-leading conflictants/violents were on screen too briefly for an adequate assessment to be made. The trait scores for all characters and for status, sex and role comparisons follow.

a) All Characters

An examination of Table III-86 reveals that the characters taken as a whole were not terribly distinctive. Of the 42 traits, 22 had absolute values of 5 or less and only 6 had absolute values of 10 or more (out of a possible total of 25). The only distinctive traits for the characters overall, then, were: unusualness, masculinity (largely as a result of the overwhelming majority of male characters, one would assume), cleanliness, boldness, interestingness and activity.

TABLE III-86

TRAIT SCORES FOR ALL CHARACTERS

Youthfulness	0.1
Height	0.4
* Usualness	-13.6
Unemotionalness	-6.3
Honesty	1.9
* Masculinity	10.5
Happiness	-1.9
Attractiveness	7.4
Toughness	6.8
Morality	1.1
Predictability	-0.1
Wholesomeness	0.2
Rationality	3.7
Sensitivity	1.8
Efficiency	6.2
Kindness	-1.6
Knowledgability	6.7
* Cleanliness	14.2
Logicality	4.2
* Boldness	11.2
Sociability	7.3
Humility	-8.3
Wealth	6.9
Goodness	1.7
Non-violence	-0.7
Sophistication	8.3
Sexual Attractiveness	9.5
Non-materialism	-9.4
Competence	8.5
* Interestingness	12.9
Satisfaction	-3.7
Fairness	0.2
Warmth	1.2

* Traits worthy of note

Table III-86 (continued)

Strength	1.5
Power	6.1
* Activity	12.0
Intelligence	5.9
Stability	3.9
Non-sarcasm	0.2
Accomodatingness	2.8
Wisdom	-3.3
Non-flirtatiousness	-2.4

* Traits worthy of note

b) Leading and Non-Leading Characters

There are not a tremendously large number of differences between leading and non-leading characters (Table III-87). In addition, almost all the differences are of degree rather than kind (with the exception of the leading characters being smart and the non-leading stupid) and in almost all cases, the leading characters are the more distinctive (the sole exception being the fact that the non-leading characters are more foolish). The leading characters, then, are more unusual, attractive, efficient, knowledgeable, sophisticated, competent, interesting and active, and cleaner and wealthier.

TABLE III-87
 TRAIT SCORES BY STATUS

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Youthfulness	-0.6	1.1
Height	0.3	0.8
* Usualness	-15.2	-9.1
Unemotionalness	-6.8	-4.9
Honesty	2.4	0.8
Masculinity	11.6	7.6
Happiness	-3.1	1.1
* Attractiveness	8.9	3.4
Toughness	6.5	7.6
Morality	1.4	0.4
Predictability	-2.1	5.3
Wholesomeness	1.5	-3.4
Rationality	4.7	0.8
Sensitivity	3.6	-3.1
* Efficiency	8.2	0.8
Kindness	-0.7	-4.2
* Knowledgability	8.4	1.9
* Cleanliness	17.0	6.4
Logicality	5.4	0.8
Boldness	10.9	12.1
Sociability	8.3	4.6
Humility	-9.0	-6.5
* Wealth	8.4	2.7
Goodness	1.7	1.9
Non-violence	-0.3	-1.9
* Sophistication	10.5	2.3
Sexual Attractiveness	10.5	6.8
Non-materialism	-10.1	-7.6
* Competence	10.4	3.4
* Interestingness	15.1	6.8
Satisfaction	-4.8	-0.4
Fairness	1.4	-3.0

* Differences worthy of note

Table III-87 (continued)

	<u>Leading</u>	<u>Non-Leading</u>
Warmth	2.1	-1.1
Strength	1.4	1.9
Power	8.6	-0.8
* Activity	14.4	5.3
Intelligence	9.1	-3.1
Stability	3.8	3.8
Non-sarcasm	1.0	-1.9
Accomodatingness	4.8	-2.7
Wisdom	-1.9	-6.8
Non-flirtatiousness	-2.4	-2.7

* Differences worthy of note

c) Male and Female Characters

The male/female comparison produced more numerous differences in kind than did the leading/non-leading comparison, and the females tended to predominate in differences of degree (Table III-88). As would be expected, the males were masculine and the females feminine, with the females being more feminine than the males were masculine. In addition, the females were sensitive while the males were slightly insensitive; the males were tough while the females were slightly delicate; the males violent and the females non-violent; and the females warm and the males slightly cold.

The females were also more emotional, honest, attractive, sociable, sexually attractive,⁷ accomodating and flirtatious.⁸

TABLE III-88
 TRAIT SCORES BY SEX

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Youthfulness	-1.1	3.2
Height	0	1.8
Usualness	-14.2	-11.4
* Unemotionalness	-4.6	-12.3
* Honesty	0	8.6
* Masculinity	20.1	-22.7
Happiness	-2.5	0
* Attractiveness	5.0	15.9
* Toughness	9.0	-0.9
Morality	-0.3	5.9
Predictability	0.1	-0.9
Wholesomeness	-1.7	6.8
* Sensitivity	-0.7	10.5
Efficiency	5.5	8.6
Kindness	-3.1	3.6
Knowledgability	6.5	7.3
Cleanliness	14.3	13.6
Logicality	5.6	-0.9
Boldness	11.2	11.3
* Sociability	5.5	13.6
Humility	-8.6	-7.3
Wealth	7.6	4.6
Goodness	-0.1	8.2
* Non-violence	-4.1	10.9
Sophistication	7.4	11.4
* Sexual attractiveness	7.3	17.3
Non-materialism	-9.5	-9.1
Competence	8.0	10.5
Interestingness	12.5	14.1
Satisfaction	-3.5	-4.1
Fairness	-1.7	6.8

* Differences worthy of note

Table III-88 (continued)

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
* Warmth	-1.7	11.4
Strength	3.3	-4.6
Power	8.2	-1.4
Activity	12.8	9.1
Intelligence	6.0	5.5
Stability	4.0	3.2
Non-sarcasm	-0.3	1.8
* Accomodatingness	1.4	7.7
Wisdom	-3.7	-1.8
* Non-flirtatiousness	-1.1	-7.3

* Differences worthy of note

d) Protagonists and Antagonists

A comparison of trait scores for protagonists and antagonists (with "mixed" roles excluded) produced the greatest contrasts of all the comparisons. Differences in kind occurred for 19 of the 42 traits, and differences in degree occurred in an additional 13. And the nature of the differences would seem to indicate that the forces of good and evil are fairly clearly delineated in the film world.

The traits on which the protagonists were positive while the antagonists were negative include: honesty, happiness, attractiveness, morality, wholesomeness, rationality, sensitivity, kindness, knowledgability, sociability, goodness, non-violence, sophistication, fairness, warmth, stability, "non-sarcasm," accomodatingness and wisdom. In addition, protagonists were also more positive than antagonists on efficiency, cleanliness, sexual attractiveness, competence, interestingness and intelligence, and were more emotional. The antagonists, on the other hand, tended to be more unusual, masculine, bold, proud, materialistic and powerful.

TABLE III-89
 TRAIT SCORES BY ROLE

	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>
Youthfulness	3.2	-1.9
Height	-0.7	0
* Usualness	-11.8	-18.4
* Unemotionalness	-6.8	-1.1
* Honesty	19.6	-19.5
* Masculinity	7.5	18.1
* Happiness	6.1	-6.3
* Attractiveness	21.4	-9.6
Toughness	8.9	9.2
* Morality	17.2	-17.3
Predictability	5.0	-4.4
* Wholesomeness	17.2	-16.6
* Rationality	10.0	-2.6
* Sensitivity	12.2	-14.7
* Efficiency	11.4	1.5
* Kindness	11.1	-17.3
* Knowledgeability	14.7	-0.4
* Cleanliness	18.2	12.5
Logicality	6.1	3.3
* Boldness	9.7	14.7
* Sociability	14.7	-2.6
* Humility	-3.9	-12.5
Wealth	4.7	9.2
* Goodness	18.9	-18.0
* Non-violence	8.2	-9.2
* Sophistication	9.3	5.2
* Sexual Attractiveness	13.9	4.1
* Non-materialism	-5.0	-15.5
* Competence	16.1	1.1
* Interestingness	16.8	9.9
Satisfaction	1.8	-7.7
* Fairness	15.7	-15.8

* Differences worthy of note

Table III-89 (continued)

	<u>Protagonists</u>	<u>Antagonists</u>
* Warmth	15.0	-16.6
Strength	3.6	0.4
* Power	3.6	13.6
Activity	13.9	14.7
* Intelligence	13.6	1.1
* Stability	12.5	-4.4
* Non-sarcasm	5.4	-5.5
* Accomodatingness	9.7	-5.2
* Wisdom	7.2	-12.5
Non-flirtatiousness	-1.4	-1.5

* Differences worthy of note

9. The Character Structure of Characters

a) All Characters

In an attempt to discover if there was an underlying "character structure" for all characters, a factor analysis of the trait scores was performed.⁹ Table III-90 presents the six main factors that were discovered. Together these six factors accounted for 87.5 per cent of all variation in the data.

The first personality trait was what might be called "basic humanity." The second trait, "rugged assertiveness," was a combination of physical stamina and outgoing-ness. "Intellect" combined elements of thinking ability and knowledge as the third factor. The fourth factor was "contentment," the fifth "ability" and the sixth was "materialistic savoir faire."

TABLE III-90

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF TRAITS FOR ALL CHARACTERS

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Goodness	.78					
Morality	.78					
Fairness	.77					
Warmth	.77					
Kindness	.77					
Sensitivity	.75					
Wholesomeness	.74					
Honesty	.73					
Sociability	.60					
Toughness		.79				
Strength		.74				
Boldness		.61				
Activity		.56				
Rationality			.65			
Logicality			.63			
Knowledge			.62			
Intelligence			.51			
Happiness				.82		
Satisfaction				.77		
Efficiency					.83	
Competence					.80	
Wealth						.73
Sophistication						.54
Non-materialism						-.51
PER CENT OF TOTAL VARIATION	40.0	16.1	10.3	8.7	7.3	5.2

b) Males and Females

The character structure for males is presented in Table III-91 and for females in Table III-92. The first factors for both males and females are fairly similar to the first factor for all characters, but somewhat more complex in the case of the males and less complex in the case of the females.¹⁰ This first factor for females can be considered to be a "pleasant humanity," while the one for males is more of a "sensible humanity."

Rather large differences begin to emerge beyond this first trait, however. Men are characterized by the "rugged assertiveness" seen earlier for all characters, while women are "knowing." Men are next "thoroughly wordly" and women "reticently non-materialistic." There is some basic similarity in the fourth factor with men "content" and women "restrainedly content." Next, men are "able" and women "pulchritudinous." Finally, as men seem "withdrawn," women are "robust." The character profiles of males and females can be summarized (in order of importance) as follows:

Males

sensibly humane
 ruggedly assertive
 thoroughly wordly
 content
 able
 withdrawn

Females

pleasantly humane
 knowing
 reticently non-materialistic
 restrainedly content
 pulchritudinous
 robust

TABLE III-91

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF TRAITS FOR MALE CHARACTERS

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Morality	.85					
Goodness	.84					
Honesty	.83					
Wholesomeness	.81					
Fairness	.79					
Kindness	.78					
Attractiveness	.75					
Sensitivity	.75					
Warmth	.68					
Rationality	.55					
Stability	.54					
Wisdom	.52					
Toughness		.75				
Strength		.71				
Boldness		.68				
Activity		.55				
Sophisticated			.71			
Cleanliness			.58			
Knowledge			.56			
Intelligence			.56		.54	
Logicality			.54			
Satisfaction				.83		
Happiness				.77		
Competence					.85	
Efficiency					.78	
Sociability						-.55
Non-flirtatiousness						.51
PER CENT OF TOTAL VARIATION	42.3	15.5	10.4	8.4	7.5	5.2

TABLE III-92

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF TRAITS FOR FEMALE CHARACTERS

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Warmth	.86					
Kindness	.80					
Sensitivity	.73					
Fairness	.72					
Goodness	.66					
Attractiveness	.61					
Sociability	.56					
Knowledge		.84				
Intelligence		.71				
Rationality		.64				
Sophistication		.53				
Wisdom		.51				
Non-materialism			.77			
Non-flirtatiousness			.72			
Boldness			-.58			
Satisfaction				.85		
Happiness				.83		
Unemotionality				.59		
Masculinity					-.78	
Sexual attractiveness					.69	
Strength						.78
Toughness						.75
Activity						.66
Power						.64
PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIATION	27.7	15.6	11.4	9.0	7.3	6.2

c) Protagonists, Antagonists and "Mixed" Role Types

Tables III-93 through III-95 give the character structures for the various role types. The protagonists, as would be expected, exhibited positive characteristics. The antagonists, however, were not simply negative mirror-images of the protagonists as one might expect on the basis of the stereotypes of "good guys" and "bad guys" in films. This phenomenon may perhaps be accounted for by the even greater predominance of males among antagonists than any other role type (Table III-40) and the overwhelming positive character structure that males exhibit (Table III-91). It could also mean, perhaps, that the forces of good and evil are less clearly delineated in modern films than they were in the era of "white hats" and "black hats." Recalling the comparison of trait scores for protagonists and antagonists (Table III-89), however, the results of this factor analysis can most likely be accounted for by the fact that all the negative attributes for the antagonists are positively intercorrelated, thereby reducing their impact. Nevertheless, this is an area that certainly warrants further investigation given the way in which it flies in the face of conventional assumptions and expectations.

The "mixed" characters were positive as well, and were a sort of amalgam of male and female characteristics. A listing of the character structures for all three role types is given below:

Protagonists

good-naturedly
upright
shrewdly capable
non-violently strong

restrainedly content
open
worldly ambitious
virtuous

Mixed

staidly upright

appealingly open
ruggedly assertive

content
able
non-materialistic
youthfully sexy

Antagonists

restrainedly
content
well-heeled
interestingly
capable
concerned
erratic
fresh

TABLE III-93

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF TRAITS FOR PROTAGONISTS

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Morality	.81						
Honesty	.75						
Wholesomeness	.72						
Non-Sarcasm	.71						
Intelligence		.77					
Efficiency		.77					
Knowledge		.74					
Wisdom		.68					
Competence		.64					
Rationality		.54					
Logicality		.52					
Tough			.88				
Strength			.84				
Masculinity			.57				
Violence			-.56				
Power			.53				
Happiness				.87			
Satisfaction				.86			
Unemotionalness				.60			
Warmth					.77		
Sociability					.58		
Sophistication						.72	
Non-materialism						-.52	
Goodness						.51	.56
Non-flirtatious- ness							.55
PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIATION	27.7	18.1	10.5	9.3	8.4	6.8	5.4

TABLE III-94

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF TRAITS FOR "MIXED" ROLE CHARACTERS

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
Morality	.64						
Wholesomeness	.63						
Predictability	.61						
Rationality	.59						
Stability	.58						
Honesty	.57						
Warmth		.80					
Sensitivity		.68					
Sociability		.62					
Attractiveness		.51					
Boldness			.82				
Toughness			.80				
Strength			.71				
Activity			.62				
Happiness				.85			
Satisfaction				.78			
Efficiency					.88		
Competence					.77		
Intelligence					.55		
Wealth						-.72	
Non-materialism						.73	
Sexual Attractiveness							.66
Age							.64
TOTAL PER CENT OF VARIATION	24.5	15.2	13.0	9.2	7.7	6.9	4.4

TABLE III-95

FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR TRAITS FOR ANTAGONISTS

	Factor <u>1</u>	Factor <u>2</u>	Factor <u>3</u>	Factor <u>4</u>	Factor <u>5</u>	Factor <u>6</u>
Satisfaction	.75					
Happiness	.74					
Unemotionalness	.50					
Cleanliness		.81				
Wealth		.65				
Sophistication		.65				
Efficiency			.82			
Competence			.80			
Interestingness			.63			
Intelligence			.55			
Sensitivity				.65		
Attractiveness				.64		
Kindness				.51		
Warmth				.50		
Non-materialism				.50		
Predictability					-.72	
Activity					.56	
Non-flirtatiousness						-.85
Sociability						.66
PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIATION	22.1	15.4	11.0	8.3	6.4	6.1

B. Relationships

Another area of concern in the study was the manner in which characters related to each other in interpersonal situations. This was accomplished by employing an additional unit of analysis, "the relationship." Only relationships which occurred between codeable characters (i.e. leading and/or non-leading characters) were considered. If one wanted to differentiate between this kind of relationship and more long-term, intense ones, one could probably conceive of relationships here discussed as "interactions."¹¹

1. The Nature of Relationships for All Films

Table III-96 to Table III-98 reveal the nature of relationships for the films considered as a whole. The single largest category of relationships is among friends, co-workers and acquaintances, followed by opponents and public authorities (Table III-96). There is almost an even division between close relationships (marital through friends, etc.) and more distant ones.

When one looks at quality of relationships, there is almost an even division among "positive," "negative" and other forms (Table III-97). The very small percentage for "neutral" relationships would indicate a very small measure of indifference in social interactions in the film world.

As for the power element in relationships, Table III-98 indicates that slightly more than half of the codeable relationships are those in which one party exerts its will over another.

Table III-99 presents the quality of relationships for the various relationship types (excluding unclear relationships

TABLE III-96

DISTRIBUTION OF RELATIONSHIP TYPES FOR ALL FILMS

Marital	2.5%
Family	6.8
Romantic	3.0
Friends, co-workers and acquaintances	37.4
Professional and Service	9.1
Public authorities	14.5
Opponents	20.7
Strangers	4.8
Other	0.5
Unclear	<u>0.7</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-97

DISTRIBUTION OF QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS

FOR ALL FILMS

Positive	32.1%
Neutral	8.5
Negative	29.7
Mixed	19.1
Not appropriate, could not be coded	<u>10.6</u>
	100.0%

TABLE III-98

DISTRIBUTION OF EXTENT OF DOMINANCE IN

RELATIONSHIPS FOR ALL FILMS

Equality	39.5%
Inequality	46.7
Not Codeable	<u>13.8</u>
	100.0%

and those which could not be coded according to type). As might be expected, the closer relationships were more positive and less negative than the more distant ones. Marital relationships, however, were much more evenly divided on the "positive" and "negative" categories than were the other close relationships.

Relationships between opponents were overwhelmingly negative while those with public authorities were almost half negative and also largely mixed. Professional and service relationships experienced the greatest neutrality and were close to being evenly split among all four categories. Relationships with strangers were the most mixed.

There was a similar pattern of differences between close and distant relationships for extent of dominance (Table III-100). Close relationships tended to be more equitable while distant ones were more inequitable, with the exception of romantic relationships. It is interesting to note that romantic relationships are slightly inequitable, while two-thirds of marital ones are equitable.

The differences between the close and distant relationships, then, would tend to be in line with the general impression that the films convey of individuals receiving supportive behaviour from family and friends but not being able to rely on others.

TABLE III-99

QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE

[illegible]

TABLE III-100

EXTENT OF DOMINANCE IN RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE

[illegible]

2. Relationships in Canadian and Non-Canadian Films

When one compares the quality of relationships for the two basic production sources, a major contrast appears (Tables III-101 and III-102). Non-Canadian films tended to be more positive in their portrayal of close relationships than did Canadian films, with the exception of romantic relationships (but there was only one such case in Canadian films). On the other hand, distant relationships were more negatively presented in non-Canadian films, while Canadian films have a predominance of "mixed" relationships with public authorities and positive relationships with strangers. It should also be noted that a much greater percentage of all distant relationships took place with public authorities in Canadian films (42.2 per cent) than was the case for non-Canadian films (27.4 per cent).

A somewhat different pattern emerges for the extent of dominance in a relationship (Tables III-103 and III-104). Close relationships tended to be relationships of equality in both Canadian and non-Canadian films, with the exception of romantic relationships for non-Canadian films. Distant relationships, on the other hand, were predominantly inequitable for both production sources, except for the relationship between strangers which was exclusively equitable for Canadian films.

TABLE III-101

QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR NON-CANADIAN FILMS

	Friends					Public Authorities	Opponents	Strangers	Other
	Marital	Family	Romantic	Co-Workers Acquaintances	Professional and Service				
Positive	57.1%	77.5%	65.0%	68.0%	20.3%	3.8%	0.8%	--	--
Neutral	7.1	-	5.0	6.4	30.5	15.0	6.9	8.3%	--
Negative	28.6	7.5	5.0	6.4	27.1	55.0	86.3	20.8	50.0%
Mixed	7.1	15.0	25.0	19.2	22.0	26.3	6.1	70.8	50.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

181

TABLE III-102

QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR CANADIAN FILMS

	Friends									
	Marital		Family	Romantic	Co-Workers Acquaintances	Professional and Service	Public Authorities	Opponents	Strangers	Other
Positive	20.0%	60.0%		100.0%	47.8%	--	5.3%	--	71.4%	--
Neutral	--	--		--	21.7	--	5.3	--	14.3	--
Negative	60.0	--		--	13.0	--	21.1	75.0%	--	--
Mixed	20.0	40.0		--	17.4	--	68.4	25.0	14.3	--
	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	--	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	--

TABLE III-103

EXTENT OF DOMINANCE IN RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR NON-CANADIAN FILMS

	Marital	Family	Romantic	Friends Co-Workers Acquaintances	Professional and Service	Public Authorities	Opponents	Strangers	Other
Equality	69.2%	53.6%	45.0%	78.4%	20.4%	24.7%	14.8%	13.6%	--
Inequality	30.8	46.4	55.0	21.6	79.6	75.3	85.2	86.4	100.0%
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-104

EXTENT OF DOMINANCE IN RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR CANADIAN FILMS

	Marital	Family	Romantic	Friends Co-Workers Acquaintances	Professional and Service	Public Authorities	Opponents	Strangers	Other
Equality	60.0%	60.0%	100.0%	72.7%	--	5.3%	13.3%	100.0%	--
Inequality	40.0	40.0	--	27.3	--	94.7	86.7	--	--
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

3. Relationships in Popular and Not-So-Popular Films

The quality of relationships by relationship type demonstrated a pattern similar to that for Canadian and non-Canadian films for both popular and not-so-popular films, although there were some variations between the two (Tables III-105 and III-106). Close relationships were generally positive for both popularity levels with the exception of marital relations in not-so-popular films; however, the popular films had an even higher rate of negative marital relationships. The distant relationships were generally negative in both popularity levels. Exceptions were highly "neutral," and somewhat "positive" and "mixed" professional-and-service relationships in popular films; highly "mixed" relationships with strangers in popular films; and highly "mixed" relationships with public authorities in not-so-popular films. Opponents, as usual, had the highest "negative" relationships in both.

The tendency for close relationships to be more equitable and distant ones to be more inequitable was more or less in evidence for both popularity levels (Tables III-107 and III-108). Romance relationships for popular films, and marital relationships and those between strangers for not-so-popular films, all deviated from these trends, however.

It also seemed to be the case that distant relationships were even more inequitable than close ones were equitable.

TABLE III-107

EXTENT OF BALANCE IN RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR POPULAR FILMS

[illegible]

TABLE III-108

EXTENT OF BALANCE IN RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR NOT-SO-POPULAR FILMS

	Friends					
	Marital		Co-Workers		Public	
	<u>Family</u>	<u>Romance</u>	<u>Acquaintances</u>	<u>Professional and Service</u>	<u>Authorities</u>	
Equality	33.3%	75.0%	69.1%	14.3%	5.3%	Strangers
Inequality	66.7	25.0	30.9	85.7	94.7	Others
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

4. Relationships in Action and Non-Action Films

For action and non-action films, the quality of relationships by relationship types follows what has come to be the usual pattern: positive in the close relationships and negative in the more distant ones (Tables III-109 and III-110). The pattern is broken by the negative quality of marital relationships for action films and the mixed relationships between strangers for the non-action ones, as well as by the relatively even spread of professional-and-service relationships among the four categories for both. It should be noted, perhaps, that the difference in split between close and distant relationships is greater for film type than it was for either popularity level or production source. Close relationships constitute 56.5 per cent of all relationships for non-action films while they constitute only 45.2 per cent of relationships for action ones. The breakdown is much closer to 50-50 for these two broad categories for popular/not-so-popular and Canadian/non-Canadian comparisons.

As for the equitability of relationships, the close-equitable/distant-inequitable pattern seemed to hold, with the exception of marital and romantic relationships, and relationships between strangers for action films, and romantic ones for non-action films (Tables III-111 and III-112). In addition, the close relationships were considerably more equitable and the distant ones somewhat more inequitable for non-action films as compared to action ones.

TABLE III-109

QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR ACTION FILMS

[illegible]

TABLE III-110

QUALITY OF RELATIONSHIP BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR NON-ACTION FILMS

	Friends						Other		
	<u>Marital</u>	<u>Family</u>	<u>Romantic</u>	<u>Co-Workers</u>	<u>Professional</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Opponents</u>	<u>Strangers</u>	<u>Other</u>
				<u>Acquaintances</u>	<u>and Service</u>	<u>Authorities</u>			
Positive	53.8%	73.3%	70.0%	69.3%	15.2%	1.6%	5.3%	18.2%	--
Neutral	7.7	--	10.0	5.7	30.3	14.8	5.3	9.1	--
Negative	23.1	--	--	7.1	27.3	47.5	78.9	--	50.0%
Mixed	<u>15.4</u>	<u>26.7</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>17.9</u>	<u>27.3</u>	<u>36.1</u>	<u>10.5</u>	<u>72.7</u>	<u>50.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE III-111

EXTENT OF DOMINANCE IN RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR ACTION FILMS

[illegible]

TABLE III-112

EXTENT OF DOMINANCE IN RELATIONSHIPS BY RELATIONSHIP TYPE FOR NON-ACTION FILMS

	Friends					
	Marital		Co-Workers		Public Authorities	
	<u>Family</u>	<u>Romantic</u>	<u>Acquaintances</u>	<u>Professional and Service</u>	<u>Opponents</u>	<u>Strangers</u>
	<u>Other</u>					
Equality	84.6%	60.0%	83.5%	27.6%	8.5%	27.3%
Inequality	15.4	40.0	16.5	72.4	91.5	72.7
	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

C. Summary

After the extensive and detailed analysis of characters and the relationships found in these films, there were few real surprises. Perhaps it can be said that in this area the accepted stereotypes are most evident, with strong indications that producers do not feel that audiences expect a great deal of subtlety in the depiction of characters.

Of the characters coded, nearly half (49.7 per cent) of the characters were identified as being leading characters, the rest being minor characters who were involved in some form of conflict or violent behaviour. As to the sex of characters, the movies are becoming more and more a male preserve, as many recent commentators have noted, with male characters occupying 81.9 per cent of the identified characters in these 25 films. The predominant age of the characters was the 19-40 group, followed by the 41-64 group, with 57.6 per cent and 34.9 per cent respectively. Only 7.5 per cent of all characters were outside these two age brackets. In particular, the 12-18 group (1.4 per cent) was vastly underrepresented when compared to the attendance level of this age group. Most characters (64.6 per cent) had an "unspecified" marital status, with 17.6 per cent clearly single, and 10.5 per cent married. This again reflects an important deviation from "real-life" situations; but characters with an "unattached" status have always predominated in popular culture, as it is easier to place them into a variety of situations (romantic and action) without the encumbrances of a family.

In terms of discernible income level, 28.6 per cent were identified as being "upper income," and 28.9 per cent as white

collar. Blue collar (9.7 per cent) and students (2.2 per cent) were again underrepresented when gauged against the true demographic distribution of the population. In terms of racial groups, 42.7 per cent of all characters were white Americans, followed by white non-North Americans (which included North American ethnics) at 28.1 per cent. Thus 70.8 per cent of all characters were white, while 9.7 per cent were oriental and only 2.7 per cent were blacks. The distribution of racial groups by role type showed no appreciable differences, however, suggesting that here, at least, heroes and villains are spread evenly across all racial types.

One major stereotypical confirmation was the relatively high number of characters who were identified as law enforcers (13.8 per cent public, 2.7 per cent private); this is quite understandable in terms of current motion picture plots. (Interestingly, only 16.3 per cent of female characters were identified as housewives, with 44.9 per cent employed in "general" occupations. Here, at least, some women are escaping the kitchen.)

Reflecting the "positive" tone noted in motion pictures overall, 50.3 per cent of the characters were judged to be successful in one degree or another; while only 17.0 per cent were clearly identifiable as failures. Nevertheless, 42.9 per cent of all characters ended up being judged as "losers" in the final outcome. This apparent difference can be accounted for by pointing out that "success" as a positive character image does not always guarantee success in the final outcome of the plot. Thus 18.9 per cent of all protagonists were considered to be "losers" in the final outcome.

In examining the differences between leading and non-leading characters, the leading characters were somewhat older, contained more whites, contained more law enforcement officers, had a slightly greater degree of psychological instability, and used more alcohol and tobacco. The leading characters were also slightly more "good guy" than "bad guy," and non-leading characters were much more likely to be losers than winners.

In fact, there are a large number of minor characters who are not on screen long enough for us to learn much about them and end up being "losers" (most often by being put to death). This suggests the existence of a class of movie characters who act as foils to the leading protagonists much in the way that Pringle describes the role of non-regulars to regulars in television series, but which he feels to be "a direct result of the [television] series as a form."¹²

When comparing Canadian and non-Canadian films, there are discernible differences. Canadian films had a larger proportion of leading characters (reflecting smaller cast budgets no doubt); were more "adult" in character composition, and, as expected, had more white characters. Interestingly, Canadian characters were much more difficult to code for income and occupation, but were shown to be more psychologically disordered. Also, the use of imprisonment as a final punishment for wrong doing was much more prevalent than the use of extermination in Canadian films.

It is in the examination of "trait scores" that we find the most interesting, albeit confirmatory data. While the characters as a whole were not terribly distinctive, those traits clearly identified gave graphic evidence of the perpetua-

tion of stereotypes. Thus leading characters tended to be more unusual, attractive, efficient, knowledgeable, sophisticated, competent, interesting, active, cleaner and wealthier. The stereotypes were especially strong in the identified traits of males (insensitive, tough, cold, violent) when compared to females (sensitive, delicate, warm, non-violent).

It is in comparison of the traits for "role type" that the greatest differences were observable, with protagonists being more honest, happy, attractive, moral, wholesome, rational, sensitive, kind, knowledgeable, sociable, non-violent, etc. Antagonists tended to be more masculine, bolder, proud, materialistic and powerful.

In performing a factor analysis of the trait scores for all characters, six main factors were discovered, which accounted for 87.5 per cent of all the variation in the data. Here again, the differences between males and females are stereotyped; but more interestingly, the differences between protagonists and antagonists did not emerge as simple contrasts on the same characteristics. An initial assessment would seem to indicate that this could be a result of the high inter-correlation of the negative attributes of the antagonists, but this is an area which is deserving of further study.

The examination of the relationships between characters revealed nothing startling, with the single largest category of relationships being between friends, co-workers and acquaintances. As might be expected, the closer relationships were more positive and less negative than the more distant ones. Marital relationships were much more evenly divided on the positive and negative attributes, however. As noted in the

body of the study: "The differences between the close and distant relationships, then, would tend to be in line with the general impression that the films convey of individuals receiving supportive behaviour from family and friends but not being able to rely on others."

ENDNOTES

¹"Leading characters" were "all those who play leading roles representing the principle types essential to the story." A "non-leading conflictant/violent" was "a character who does not satisfy the criteria for leading characters but is involved in conflict in any form, or irrational violence, either as initiator or responder." In addition it was noted that "to be fully coded as a character, a party must be presented as a distinguishable individual at some point in the film."

²There is a large discrepancy between the age of the characters in the films and the age of the audience viewing the films. The tables below give the age breakdown for the movie audiences in Canada and the U.S.

DISTRIBUTION OF MOVIE ATTENDANCE IN CANADA
BY AGE GROUP

Age	Age groups as % of total population 14 years of age and over attending movies		
14-19	29		
20-24	18]	54
25-34	22		
35-44	14		
45-64	15		
65 +	<u>2</u>		
	100		

Source: Secretary of State, A Leisure Study - Canada 1972
(Ottawa, 1973)

AGE OF U.S. MOTION PICTURE AUDIENCES, 1976

Age	Percent of Total Yearly Admissions		Percent of Population	
12-15	14]	45	10]	22
16-20	31]		12]	
21-24	15]		9]	
25-29	16]	44	10]	34
30-39	13]		15]	
40-49	5]	8	13]	26
50-59	3]		13]	
60 and over	<u>3</u>		<u>18</u>	
	100		100	

Source: Opinion Research Corporation, Incidence of Motion Picture Attendance, Study for the Motion Picture Association of America, 1976.

While the age breakdowns are not completely comparable (either to each other or to the age breakdowns for the characters), it can be seen that the younger segment of the population is over represented. In the U.S., the 22 per cent of the population in the age range 12-20 account for 45 per cent of the admissions. The figures for the Canadian situation become more pertinent if it is pointed out that 14-19 age group accounts for 40 per cent of the "frequent" movie attenders.

³Non-leading characters, being defined as they were, were often on screen for only brief periods making the coding of many background variables impossible. Such instances will be noted below.

⁴Extrapolating from labour statistics, almost two-thirds of married Canadian women would appear to be housewives, while somewhere between 50 per cent and 60 per cent of married American women would appear to be so. Gail Cook (ed.), Opportunity for Choice: A Goal for Women in Canada (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1976) and Statistical Abstracts of the United States, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1974.

⁵George Gerbner, "Violence in Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions," in G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (ed.), Television and Social Behavior, Volume 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 60.

⁶It should be noted that 35.1 per cent of "protagonists," 55.9 per cent of "mixed" and 87.6 per cent of "antagonists" could not be specified as to marital status.

⁷It is of interest to note that all four coders in this study were males and the results could be partly an artifact of sexual bias. This situation with regard to coding is exactly the opposite of the case of the entertainment television content study in which all the coders were female.

⁸While the study did produce certain differences between images of males and females in films, these differences do not seem to be as great as differences in television drama. See Leeda P. Marting, "An Empirical Study of Images of Males and Females During Prime-time Television Drama." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1973. Perhaps the important point to note in Marting's study is the fact that there were more differences between male and female images in television drama than in real life.

⁹"Factor analysis is a means by which the regularity and order in phenomena can be discerned. . . . it takes thousands and potentially millions of measurements and qualitative observations and resolves them into distinct patterns of occurrence." R. J. Rummel, "Understanding factor analysis," The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. XI, No. 4 (December, 1967), p. 445. The type of factor analysis employed was a principal-component solution with orthogonal rotation (VARIMAX).

¹⁰The influence of the overwhelming number of males in the films can be seen in the fairly close correspondence between the character structure for males and the one for all characters.

¹¹The coding instructions for identifying a relationship stated: "A Relationship is considered to be any on-screen interaction (of even the simplest form) between parties such that both parties are aware of the existence (if not the identity) of each other. It would require their acknowledgment of each other as individuals. . . . In addition, if parties act in concert but are not explicitly in contact on the screen, they could still have a codeable relationship if contextual information would indicate interactions between the characters had taken place."

¹²Ashley Pringle, "A Methodology for Television Analysis with Reference to the Drama Series," Screen, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Summer, 1972), p. 126.

CHAPTER IV

INCIDENTS

A. All Incidents

1. General Presentation

In total there were 671 "incidents" identified in the 25 films included in the sample.¹ Of these, 293, or 43.7 per cent were identified as realistic violent conflict; the next highest category being realistic argument (18.0 per cent). Overall, realistic portrayals of conflict incidents accounted for almost all of these incidents (89.7 per cent). In comparing incident types as to their treatment, violent conflict, destruction of property and theft were the most stylized (Table IV-1). Irrational violence and harm to self had the highest "mixed" approaches. Most incident types were heavily realistic, with the verbal ones tending to be even more so than the physical ones.

In terms of the details of such incidents, violent conflicts were portrayed in great detail 56.6 per cent, in some detail 28.3 per cent, and sketchily only 15.0 per cent of the time (Table IV-2). Irrational violence was even more sketchily presented. Arguments were portrayed in great detail 90.3 per cent of the time. In the 12 cases of harm to self, these incidents tended to be presented in lesser detail. Surprisingly, theft tended to be portrayed in lesser detail, with great detail accounting for only 41.7 per cent of the cases presented. There seems to be a distinct difference

TABLE IV-1
METHOD OF TREATMENT BY INCIDENT TYPE

	Violent Conflict	Argument	Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict	Irrational Violence	Verbal Abuse	Harm to Self	Destruction of Property	Theft
Realistic	86.4%	97.6%	100.0%	81.0%	100.0%	91.7%	81.1%	91.7%
Stylized	10.3	--	--	2.4	--	--	15.1	8.3
Mixed	3.2	2.4	--	16.7	--	8.3	3.8	--
	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

198

TABLE IV-2
EXTENT OF DETAIL BY INCIDENT TYPE

	Violent Conflict	Argument	Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict	Irrational Violence	Verbal Abuse	Harm to Self	Destruction of Property	Theft
Great Detail	56.6%	90.3%	85.5%	69.0%	88.9%	16.7%	66.0%	41.7%
Some Detail	28.3	9.7	12.9	9.5	11.1	33.3	22.6	41.7
Sketchy	15.0	--	1.6	21.4	--	50.0	11.3	16.7
	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%

between verbal and physical incidents: verbal incidents are presented in greater detail and physical ones somewhat more sketchily.

If we combine and collapse just those categories which can be called conflict incidents (violent conflict, argument and non-violent, non-argument conflict) this would encompass 525 incidents. Of these, 68.0 per cent were portrayed in great detail, 22.1 per cent in some detail, and 9.9 per cent were sketchy. Thus overall, conflict situations are portrayed in more detail than non-conflict incidents.

The question of whether the situations under examination were essential to the structure or plot of the films was also examined. Of the 671 incidents, 308 (45.9 per cent) were considered to be essential, or "incidents which play a major role in the plot"; 20.1 per cent were considered to be factorial, i.e. "minor incidents which provide the necessary causal conditions for the major ones"; 28.5 per cent were representational, or those "that make the plot more probable or effective"; and 5.5 per cent were ornamental, or those "that are necessary neither to the plot nor the representation."² However, within incident type there are a few interesting cross-comparisons (Table IV-3). Irrational violence is considered to be essential only 23.8 per cent of the time, being portrayed as representational 42.9 per cent, and both factorial and ornamental 16.7 per cent of the time. Verbal abuse was most often portrayed as representational (55.6 per cent) and considered essential in only 18.5 per cent of the cases, while harm to self was more often representational (58.3 per cent) than essential (25.0 per cent).

TABLE IV-3

PLOT FUNCTION BY INCIDENT TYPE

	Violent Conflict	Argument	Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict	Irrational Violence	Verbal Abuse	Harm to Self	Destruction of Property	Theft
Essential	57.2%	37.9%	40.3%	23.8%	18.5%	25.0%	34.0%	50.0%
Factorial	18.3	26.6	32.3	16.7	18.5	16.7	9.4	8.3
Representational	21.8	33.1	25.8	42.9	55.6	58.3	32.1	25.0
Ornamental	2.7	2.4	1.6	16.7	7.4	--	24.5	16.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If only the 525 conflict incidents are considered, it is found that 50.7 per cent of these incidents were considered to be essential, with slightly less than one half of the total number (49.3 per cent) being "non-essential." The concept of non-essential must be interpreted with caution, for many of these incidents (46.9 per cent) fall into the factorial and representational categories, while only 2.5 per cent are considered to be purely ornamental, or totally non-essential. Nevertheless, only in the category of violent conflict are more than half the incidents considered to be essential.

2. The Settings

In the examination of the settings of motion picture incidents, we discover that more than half (54.8 per cent) of all incidents occur in urban settings with the next highest category being small towns (21.8 per cent). Somewhat surprisingly, uninhabited areas (deserts, oceans) account for a higher percentage (8.9 per cent) than do suburban locations (6.1 per cent).³ The sample contained only three incidents which occurred in outerspace, which indicates the small number of such films currently available.

If we examine the habitats across categories of incidents we find many interesting variations (Table IV-4). While violent conflict occurs nearly half the time in urban settings (49.0 per cent), irrational violence tends to take place in small towns (45.2 per cent), while harm to self occurs with equal frequency in urban and small town locations (41.7 per cent).

The actual settings indicate that 41.0 per cent of all the incidents occur outdoors, with nearly one-quarter of all incidents (24.9 per cent) being violent conflict in the outdoors. Houses were the location for 11.9 per cent of all incidents, and apartments for 9.5 per cent. When individual incident types are considered, it was discovered that 66.7 per cent of all incidents of harm to self occurred outdoors, and somewhat surprisingly, 56.6 per cent of all incidents showing destruction of property (Table IV-5). While institutions were the locations of only 3.6 per cent of all incidents, 21.4 per cent of all incidents of irrational violence took place in institutions. Other interesting findings include those that arguments are more likely to take

TABLE IV-4
HABITAT OF INCIDENTS BY INCIDENT TYPE

	Violent Conflict	Argument	Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict	Irrational Violence	Verbal Abuse	Harm to Self	Destruction of Property	Theft
Urban	49.0%	64.5%	62.9%	38.1%	88.9%	41.7%	54.7%	75.0%
Suburban	5.6	5.6	9.7	2.4	7.4	--	11.3	--
Small Town	23.9	16.9	14.5	45.2	--	41.7	17.0	16.7
Uninhabited	12.4	3.2	6.5	4.8	--	16.7	9.4	8.3
Mobile	6.8	6.5	4.8	7.1	3.7	--	3.8	--
Mixed	0.6	1.6	--	2.4	--	--	1.9	--
Outer Space	0.6	--	--	--	--	--	1.9	--
Other	1.2	1.6	1.6	--	--	--	--	--
	100.1%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-5

SETTINGS OF INCIDENTS BY INCIDENT TYPE

	Violent Conflict	Argument	Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict	Irrational Violence	Verbal Abuse	Harm to Self	Destruction of Property	Theft
House	10.6%	12.9%	21.0%	16.7%	11.1%	8.3%	7.5%	--
Apartment	6.5	21.0	8.1	4.8	14.8	16.7	5.7	--
Police Station	--	1.6	1.6	2.4	14.8	--	--	--
Office	1.8	3.2	9.7	--	3.7	--	3.8	--
Small Business	2.9	4.8	11.3	2.4	3.7	--	3.8	--
Factory	2.4	1.6	1.6	--	7.4	--	--	--
Institution	2.7	--	4.8	21.4	--	8.3	1.9	8.3%
Other Indoor	19.8	25.0	12.9	16.7	25.9	--	11.3	41.7
Outdoors	49.3	25.8	24.2	31.0	18.5	66.7	56.6	41.7
Mixed	4.1	4.0	4.8	4.8	--	--	9.4	8.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

place in apartments (21.0 per cent) than in houses (12.9 per cent); and verbal abuse was equally likely to be set in apartment houses as police stations (14.8 per cent), but less frequently in houses (11.1 per cent). Nevertheless, the outdoors was the most frequent setting for almost all incident types, with the physical incidents being even more pronounced than the verbal ones in this regard.

In terms of geographic location, of the total number of incidents, 50.5 per cent were located in areas other than Canada or the United States, with 8.5 per cent in Canada, and 41.0 per cent in the U.S. Here again we find significant cross-category comparisons (Table IV-6). Violent conflict occurs with much greater frequency (58.7 per cent) in non-Canadian, non-U.S. countries, followed by the U.S. (36.3 per cent), and Canada (5.0 per cent). Arguments, however, take place in the U.S. (50.0 per cent) more often, while Canada and other countries are fairly equal at 25.8 per cent and 24.2 per cent respectively. Irrational violence takes place in other countries (66.7 per cent) far more often than in the U.S. or Canada, at 28.6 per cent and 4.8 per cent respectively. However, verbal abuse is a U.S. phenomenon (66.7 per cent), while harm to self (75.0 per cent), destruction of property (50.9 per cent), and theft (75.0 per cent) are each more frequently shown in other countries.

At what time of day do incidents take place? The analysis points overwhelmingly to the daytime for all types of incidents (Table IV-7). Only verbal abuse (46.2 per cent) and theft (45.6 per cent) approach equal nighttime presentation. The emphasis on daytime depiction may be as much a result of

TABLE IV-6
GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF INCIDENTS BY INCIDENT TYPE

[illegible]

TABLE IV-7
TIME OF OCCURRENCE OF INCIDENTS BY INCIDENT TYPE

[illegible]

the filmmaker's art, with its dependency on light, as any other factor. If we examine only the conflict incidents, we find that 65.6 per cent of all these incidents take place during the day, with little variation as to incident type.

B. Means and Ends in Conflict Incidents

In concentrating on violent, argument and non-violent, non-argument conflict, we can analyze the methods and motivations for the conflict situations. Thus, in examining the method of conflict we find that over two-thirds of violent conflict was dealt with by coercion (21.9 per cent) or elimination (46.7 per cent) (Table IV-8).⁴ Thus nearly half of all "victims" of violent conflict were eliminated from further action. Conversely 62.3 per cent of argument situations used some form of avoidance mechanism, and the same percentage of non-violent, non-argument conflicts used avoidance. Only 17.4 per cent of violent conflict used such avoidance. As expected, a significant percentage (21.3 per cent) of non-violent, non-argument conflicts employed some form of resolution; it is therefore of further significance that only 1.8 per cent of violent conflict used some form of procedural resolution. When all conflict incidents are examined, 33.3 per cent used avoidance, and 30.6 per cent elimination. Most significantly, 156 incidents, or 30.2 per cent of all conflict incidents, were violent conflicts which resulted in elimination.

The analysis of motivations for conflict situations reveals quite discernible patterns (Table IV-9). By combining those motivations concerned with the physical, the psychological, the social, the ethical and mixed motivations, we find that violent conflict tends to be physical, mixed and social in motivation (in descending order of importance).⁵ Arguments are physical, mixed, ethical and psychological, while the non-violent, non-argument conflicts are mixed, physical and social.

TABLE IV-8

METHODS OF DEALING WITH CONFLICT BY INCIDENT TYPE

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Argument</u>	<u>Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict</u>
Avoidance	17.4%	62.3%	62.3%
Resolution	1.8	13.1	21.3
Distraction	12.3	15.6	13.1
Coercion	21.9	9.0	--
Elimination	<u>46.7</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>3.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-9

MOTIVATION IN OUTCOME OF INITIATOR OF CONFLICT,
BY INCIDENT TYPE

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Argument</u>	<u>Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict</u>
Physical Gain	22.7%	19.4%	14.8%
Psychological Gain	5.6	3.2	4.9
Mixed Gain	11.5	9.7	9.8
Physical Avoidance	10.3	9.7	11.5
Psychological Avoidance	2.4	15.3	3.3
Mixed Physical and Psychological Avoidance	13.0	10.5	21.3
Social Avoidance	23.9	5.6	16.4
Ethical Avoidance	8.0	20.2	6.6
Mixed Hedonic and Social-ethical Avoidance	<u>2.7</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>11.5</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In particular the major motivations for violent conflict are physical gain (22.7 per cent), and social avoidance (23.9 per cent). For arguments the major motivation is ethical avoidance (20.2 per cent), followed by physical gain (19.4 per cent); while for non-violent conflicts, the major motivation is mixed physical and psychological avoidance (21.3 per cent) and social avoidance (16.4 per cent). Again, across all three conflict categories, physical gain accounted for 21.0 per cent of the motivation, followed by social avoidance (18.7 per cent).

In terms of the means used in the conflict incidents, the largest single category was direct attack, which was used in 60.3 per cent of the incidents. However, almost all of this was accounted for by the incidents of violent conflict. Almost all violent conflict incidents (91.7 per cent) were direct attacks (Table IV-10). Arguments, as expected, relied more heavily on persuasion (62.1 per cent) but 23.4 per cent employed threats. With non-violent, non-argument conflicts, 72.1 per cent used persuasion. All-in-all, the means used showed definite patterns with very little variations, suggesting strong stereotypes of the means the initiators of conflict employ in dealing with conflict.

In examining the initiator's provocation for engaging in the conflict, we find that the mixed category predominates with 53.8 per cent of the total of all conflict incidents; this suggests that a complex of emotional responses comes into play despite the repeated emphasis on the physical aspect.⁶ Surprisingly, the threat to security is considered a greater provocation (20.4 per cent) than physical threats (18.9 per cent) in violent conflict (Table IV-11). In non-

TABLE IV-10
 MEANS USED BY INITIATOR TO ACHIEVE GOAL,
 BY CONFLICT INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Argument</u>	<u>Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict</u>
Do Nothing	--	--	4.9%
Persuasion	--	62.1%	72.1
Seduction	--	0.8	1.6
Threat	2.4%	23.4	6.6
Direct Attack	91.7	2.4	3.3
Indirect Attack Physical	4.4	--	1.6
Indirect Attack Psychological	0.9	6.5	6.6
Passive Aggression	<u>0.6</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>3.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-11
 INTERNAL SOURCE OF PROVOCATION FOR DEALING IN CONFLICT,
 BY INCIDENT TYPE

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Argument</u>	<u>Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict</u>
Physical	18.9%	16.9%	9.8%
Psychological	8.3	16.1	6.6
Security	20.4	16.1	16.4
Mixed	<u>52.5</u>	<u>50.8</u>	<u>67.2</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

violent, non-argument conflict, security is almost twice as provocative (16.4 per cent) as physical threats (9.8 per cent).

If the provocation for engaging in the conflict is examined in terms of the social "entity" underlying it or which directs it, rather than the nature of the provocation itself, some interesting results emerge as well (Table IV-12).⁷ The provocations for engaging in conflict were basically "selfish," this tendency being even more pronounced in arguments and non-violent, non-argument conflicts than in violent ones. The latter tended to have higher rates of mixed provocations in these terms.

When justifications for engaging in conflict are examined, violent conflicts were not justified in 50.4 per cent of the cases, while the figures for argument and non-violent, non-argument conflict were 25.0 and 16.1 per cent respectively.⁸ For those cases in which the conflict was justified, violent conflicts tended to be justified in terms of defending oneself or seeking revenge, while both arguments and non-violent, non-argument conflicts were justified in social or moral terms (Table IV-13).

It is in the analysis of emotional attitudes exhibited in conflict situations that we come across some fascinating data (Table IV-14). There is a clear pattern present which suggests that violent conflict is more often than not accomplished with a "coolness," (48.1 per cent), while anger (18.6 per cent) is not the dominating emotion. With arguments, anger (60.5 per cent) is the overwhelming emotion exhibited; while in non-violent conflicts, coolness (70.5 per cent) again prevails. Surprisingly, in view of prevalent critical

TABLE IV-12
 EXTERNAL SOURCE OF PROVOCATION FOR DEALING IN CONFLICT,
 BY INCIDENT TYPE

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Argument</u>	<u>Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict</u>
Self	50.7%	62.9%	62.9%
Friends	5.3	1.6	1.6
Family	2.1	6.5	6.5
Society	3.8	3.2	6.5
Mixed	<u>38.1</u>	<u>25.8</u>	<u>22.6</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-13

JUSTIFICATION FOR INITIATING CONFLICT, BY INCIDENT TYPE

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Argument</u>	<u>Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict</u>
Defend-Revenge	44.6%	25.8%	13.5%
Moral-Social	39.3	65.6	75.0
Mixed	<u>16.1</u>	<u>8.6</u>	<u>11.5</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-14

EMOTIONAL ATTITUDE OF INITIATOR OF CONFLICT,

BY INCIDENT TYPE

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Argument</u>	<u>Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict</u>
Fear	5.9%	4.8%	9.8%
Anger	18.6	60.5	11.5
Sadism-Masochism	8.8	--	--
Irrational	2.7	4.8	1.6
Cool	48.1	18.5	70.5
Mixed	4.7	9.7	6.5
Other	<u>11.2</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>--</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

attitudes, sado-masochistic emotions play only a minor role in violent conflict (8.8 per cent). Of even greater interest is the low incidence of fear exhibited, especially in violent conflict (5.9 per cent) and arguments (4.8 per cent). In non-violent, non-argument conflict, fear accounts for 9.8 per cent of the visible emotional attitudes. Over all categories, "coolness" accounts for 43.7 per cent of visible emotional attitudes.

Finally, for the case of the outcome of the conflict, more than half of the arguments (57.3 per cent) and close to half of the rational discussions (43.5 per cent) did not have clear outcomes. This was the case for only 26.8 per cent of violent incidents. In addition, in examining the outcome of the incident for the initiator in those cases in which the outcome is not unclear, it is discovered that the initiators of violent conflict are overwhelmingly successful through their own violence (Table IV-15). In fact, violence accounts for 93.2 per cent of the results for all violent conflicts. Arguments and rational discussions are won or lost through no violence, although it is interesting to note that the initiator of a rational discussion is more likely to win than is an initiator of an argument.

TABLE IV-15
 THE OUTCOME OF THE INCIDENT FOR THE INITIATOR,
 BY INCIDENT TYPE

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Argument</u>	<u>Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflict</u>
No Stake in Outcome	0.4%	1.9%	--
Wins through own violence	72.6	--	--
Wins through violence of others	0.8	--	--
Wins through no violence	2.4	49.1	74.3%
Loses through own violence	6.5	--	--
Loses through violence of others	13.3	1.9	2.9
Loses through no violence	<u>4.0</u>	<u>47.2</u>	<u>22.9</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

C. Violent Conflict and Irrational Violence

1. The Scenario of "Violence"

If one were initially to consider the combination of both types of violent incidents, it would be possible to create a scenario of violence by decomposing the violent incidents into their constituent parts: the parties to the violence, other parties on the scene, contextual elements, the mode of violence and the consequences of violence.

a) The Parties to the Violence

As would be expected given the overwhelming extent to which the characters in the films were human beings (Table III-3), violence tends to occur almost exclusively between humans (Table IV-16). In addition, the majority of the parties to the violence were individuals, but there was an even greater tendency for individuals to be targets or victims of violence than for them to be initiators of violence (Table IV-17).

Table IV-18 reveals that more than half of the violent incidents occurred between opponents, and other high percentages occurred with authorities and between strangers. In fact, nearly 90 per cent of all violence occurred for distant relationships, which is even more notable when it is remembered that distant relationships accounted for only about half of all relationships coded for the films (Table III-96). For the 88 per cent of incidents that could be coded on the variable "group relations of parties to violence," almost two-thirds of the violence is seen to have occurred between members of the same national, ethnic and/or racial groups (Table IV-19).

TABLE IV-16
HUMANITY OF PARTIES TO VIOLENCE

	<u>Aggressor</u>	<u>Aggressee</u>
Human	96.3%	97.4%
Human with extra- human powers	1.3	1.1
Animal	1.1	0.5
Symbolic representation	--	0.3
Mixed	1.1	0.5
Unclear	<u>0.3</u>	<u>0.3</u>
	100.1%	101.1%

TABLE IV-17
INDIVIDUALITY OF PARTIES TO VIOLENCE

	<u>Aggressor</u>	<u>Aggressee</u>
Individual	53.2%	66.3%
Group	45.8	32.4
Institution	<u>1.1</u>	<u>1.3</u>
	100.1%	100.0%

TABLE IV-18

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PARTIES TO VIOLENCE

Marital	3.4%
Family	0.8
Friends	6.9
Authorities	15.8
Opponents	56.5
Strangers	14.0
Other	<u>2.5</u>
	99.9%

TABLE IV-19

GROUP RELATIONS OF PARTIES TO VIOLENCE

Same national, ethnic or racial group	63.5%
Different national, ethnic or racial group	<u>36.5</u>
	100.0%

b) Other Parties on the Scene

An aggressor had an accomplice or accomplices in almost half of the violent incidents (Table IV-20). When they were present, accomplices assisted in or encouraged violence twice as often as they were passive or acted to restrain violence. Witnesses were present slightly less often than were accomplices, and when they were present they were predominantly passive (Table IV-21). If they took action, however, they assisted or encouraged violence more than they attempted to terminate it.

Agents of the law were present in only 24.5 per cent of the violent incidents (Table IV-22). When they were present on the scene, they acted in only their official capacity almost three-quarters of the time. For those cases in which they were present, the agents of the law were initiators or targets of violence more often than they were witnesses (Table IV-23). All told, they employed violence in almost two-thirds of the cases in which they were on the scene. In addition, in those cases in which they were present, the agents of the law were most likely to commit only that violence necessary to achieve their objective, but were more likely to commit excessive violence than no violence (Table IV-24).

TABLE IV-20

THE ROLE OF ACCOMPLICES IN VIOLENCE

None shown	49.5%
Passive	13.7
Assist or encourage violence	33.7
Attempt to prevent, restrain or seek alternatives to violence	<u>3.2</u>
	100.1%

TABLE IV-21

THE ROLE OF WITNESSES IN VIOLENCE

None shown	55.3%
Passive	36.6
Assist or encourage violence	5.3
Attempt to prevent, restrain or seek alternatives to violence	<u>2.9</u>
	100.1%

TABLE IV-22

THE CAPACITY OF AGENTS OF LAW IN VIOLENCE

Not present	75.5%
Private agents only	0.8
<u>Official agents only</u>	
act in only official capacity	17.6
act in only unofficial capacity	3.9
act in mixed capacities	0.5
not shown, unclear	1.3
Mixed agents or unclear	<u>0.3</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-23

THE ROLE OF AGENTS OF THE LAW IN VIOLENCE

WHEN PRESENT ON THE SCENE

<u>Witness</u>		17.2%
Passive	8.6%	
Non-violently active	3.2	
Intervenes violently	5.4	
<u>Target of Violence</u>		37.7
Cannot respond	15.1	
Responds non-violently	2.2	
Responds violently	20.4	
<u>Initiator of Violence</u>		38.7
In course of duty	22.6	
Not in course of duty	16.1	
Mixed (several agents)	3.2	3.2
Not shown, unclear	<u>3.2</u>	<u>3.2</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-24

NECESSITY OF VIOLENCE USED BY AGENTS OF THE LAW

WHEN PRESENT ON THE SCENE

Commits no violence	25.8%
Commits only necessary violence	38.7
Commits excessive violence	31.2
Not shown, unclear	<u>4.3</u>
	100.0%

c) Contextual Elements

The violent incidents were mostly central to the plot (Table IV-25), and the violence itself was overwhelmingly intentional (Table IV-26).

The actual context of the violence was mainly sinister (Table IV-27) (i.e. involving the real threat of injury or death) and for those incidents whose contexts were not overtly comic, there was little in the way of humourous overtones (Table IV-28).

When the distance between the violent acts is examined, it is discovered that most violence was direct, inter-personal and of close proximity (Table IV-29). The incidents were almost evenly divided among unawareness, spontaneous recognition and general anticipation, but in over 60 per cent of the cases, the victim did not recognize the violence until, at the very most, it was upon him (Table IV-30).

d) Mode of Violence

Firearms and the human body were the two most frequent modes of violence, with "other" methods being the next most frequent (Table IV-31), and the remainder being very close to each other in frequency.

e) The Consequences of Violence

Table IV-32 reveals that major visible consequences were the most frequent result of violence, followed by no consequences shown and slight visible consequences. These consequences were very rarely shown in a humourous light (Table IV-33).

TABLE IV-25

CENTRALITY OF VIOLENCE TO FILM PLOT

Incidental	29.5%
Central	<u>70.5</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-26

INTENTIONALITY OF VIOLENCE

Accidental	2.1
Carelessness	1.1
Intentional	96.8
Unclear	<u>0.3</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-27

CONTEXT OF VIOLENCE

Comic context	3.7%
Sports context	3.9
Serious quarrel (but not real threat of harm)	8.9
Sinister context (real threat of harm)	80.3
Unclear	<u>3.2</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-28

HUMOUROUS OVERTONES TO VIOLENCE

Not present, irrelevant	88.2%
Comic element	<u>11.8</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-29

DISTANCE BETWEEN VIOLENTS

Close proximity	76.3%
Chase	5.0
Within view	14.2
Out of sight	2.6
Global or undirected	--
Cannot code	<u>1.8</u>
	99.9%

TABLE IV-30

COGNITIVE PREPARATION OF THE VICTIM

Unaware	32.9%
Recognizes spontaneously	28.4
General anticipation	27.4
Specific anticipation	0.8
Unclear	<u>10.5</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-31

MODE OF VIOLENCE

Body	26.6
Firearm	31.6
Hand Weapon (non-firearm)	7.9
Normally non-violent object	4.2
Vehicles	7.6
Explosives	5.0
Alcohol, Drugs	2.1
Nature	0.3
Other	<u>14.7</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-32

VISIBILITY OF PHYSICAL CONSEQUENCE OF VIOLENCE

Not shown	31.3%
Slight visible consequences	20.3
Major visible consequences	37.9
Only subsequently revealed	6.8
Not appropriate	<u>3.7</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-33

DOUBLE CONTEXT OF PHYSICAL CONTEXT OF VIOLENCE

Comedy added	8.7%
Comedy not added	<u>91.3</u>
	100.0%

In close to a third of the incidents, the victim was unable to respond, but when he was able to, he was most likely to resist violently or submit (Table IV-34).

As to the graphicness of the presentation, there was a tendency to show more pain than blood and gore (Table IV-35). In addition, there tended to be proportionately few incidences of injury and death as a result of the violence, but if they did occur, they were most often a single injury or death (Table IV-36).

Finally, in those 80 per cent of cases that could be coded for "recovery," recovery was shown to be the result in a majority of the cases, while in 41.2 per cent of such incidents, the victims were either incapacitated, restricted or dead (Table IV-37).

TABLE IV-34

IMMEDIATE RESPONSE OF VICTIM OF VIOLENCE

Unable to respond	32.4%
Submits	21.3
Withdraws	7.9
Resists violently	25.0
Flees	3.9
Attempts a solution	2.9
Mixed	1.6
Not Clear	<u>5.0</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-35

DEGREE OF ILLUSTRATED PAIN AND ILLUSTRATED BLOOD AND GORE

	<u>Pain</u>	<u>Blood and Gore</u>
None	39.7%	67.9%
Some	29.7	13.9
Much	18.2	7.1
Not Appropriate	<u>12.4</u>	<u>11.1</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-36
INJURIES AND DEATHS AS A RESULT OF VIOLENCE

	<u>Injured</u>	<u>Deaths</u>
None	58.2%	60.0%
One only	26.8	26.8
Small number (2-5)	6.6	6.8
Moderate number (6-10)	2.1	0.3
Large number (over 10)	<u>6.3</u>	<u>6.1</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-37
RECOVERY FROM VIOLENCE

Victim continues to function or recovers	52.9%
Incapacitated, restricted or dead	41.2
Consequences shown only subsequently	<u>5.8</u>
	100.0%

2. Differences Between Violent Conflict and Irrational Violence

There were a number of noteworthy differences between the treatment of violent conflict and irrational violence, and they occurred at every stage of the "scenario." For example, violent conflict took place more often between opponents, while irrational conflict took place more often between spouse, family, friends and "other" (Table IV-38).

There were also some major differences in the area of the role of the agents of the law in violence. While both were close to a 75 per cent rate of absence of agents of the law from violence (irrational violence being somewhat lower at 71.4 per cent), for those cases in which they were present, the irrational violence incidents had them initiating violence not in the course of their duties to a much greater extent (Table IV-39). In fact, all their actions deal with violent activity. In addition, the agents of the law were much more likely to commit excessive violence (Table IV-40).

The violent incidents were much more central to the film in the case of violent conflict incidents than irrational violence (Table IV-41). The percentages for central and incidental incidents here, correspond very closely to the combined figures for essential and factorial, and representational and ornamental classifications for the two incident types (Table IV-3).

Also, as might be expected, the violence in violent conflict was more intentional than it was in irrational violence, although both were heavily intentional (Table IV-42).

Violent conflict was presented more frequently in sinister

TABLE IV-38

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTIES TO VIOLENCE

BY TYPE OF VIOLENCE INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
Marital	3.0%	7.1%
Family	0.9	11.9
Friends	5.3	9.5
Authorities	15.7	--
Opponents	59.1	19.0
Strangers	14.2	16.7
Other	<u>1.8</u>	<u>35.7</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-39

THE ROLE OF AGENTS OF THE LAW IN VIOLENCE

WHEN PRESENT ON THE SCENE,

BY TYPE OF VIOLENT INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
<u>Witness</u>		
Passive	9.9%	--
Non-violently active	3.7	--
Intervenes violently	4.9	8.3%
<u>Target of Violence</u>		
Cannot respond	17.3	--
Responds non-violently	2.5	--
Responds violently	22.2	8.3
<u>Initiator of Violence</u>		
In course of duty	23.5	16.7
Not in course of duty	9.9	58.3
Mixed (several agents)	2.5	8.3
Not shown, unclear	<u>3.7</u>	<u>--</u>
	100.1%	99.9%

TABLE IV-40

NECESSITY OF VIOLENCE USED BY AGENTS OF THE LAW
WHEN PRESENT ON THE SCENE,
BY TYPE OF VIOLENT INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
Commits no violence	29.6%	--
Commits only necessary violence	43.2	8.3%
Commits excessive violence	22.2	91.7
Not shown, unclear	<u>4.9</u>	<u>--</u>
	99.9%	100.0%

TABLE IV-41

CENTRALITY OF VIOLENCE TO FILM PLOT,
BY VIOLENT INCIDENT TYPE

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
Incidental	25.7%	59.5%
Central	<u>74.3</u>	<u>40.5</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-42

INTENTIONALITY OF VIOLENCE BY TYPE OF VIOLENT INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
Accidental	0.6%	14.6%
Carelessness	0.6	4.9
Intentional	<u>98.8</u>	<u>80.5</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

contexts than irrational violence was, with irrational violence taking place more often in quarrels and comic contexts (Table IV-43). Irrational violence was even more likely to occur in close proximity than was violent conflict, however (Table IV-44). Perhaps as a result, it was not significantly more likely to catch its victims unawares, despite the fact that it took place in contexts which suggested less imminent danger.

There are a number of differences between violent conflict and irrational violence with respect to mode of violence employed: the former used more firearms, hand weapons and explosives, while the latter favoured the body, vehicles and normally non-violent objects (Table IV-45).

The physical consequences of violence tended to be less visible in irrational violence, to be less severe when they were visible and to be more often revealed subsequently (Table IV-46). The victims of irrational violence were also more capable of responding than were those of violent conflict, but they tended to submit, seek solutions or have their response be unclear more often, while the victims of violent conflict had a greater tendency to resist violently and to withdraw (Table IV-47). Finally, while there was no large difference in the extent of injury for the two violent incident types, irrational violence had a lower rate of deaths overall, but a higher rate of large numbers of deaths (Table IV-48).

TABLE IV-43

CONTEXT OF VIOLENCE BY TYPE OF VIOLENT INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
Comic context	3.0%	11.8%
Sports context	3.9	5.9
Serious quarrel (but not real threat of harm)	8.7	14.7
Sinister context (real threat of harm)	<u>84.4</u>	<u>67.6</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-44

DISTANCE BETWEEN VIOLENTS, BY TYPE OF VIOLENCE INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
Close proximity	75.5%	95.2%
Chase	5.7	--
Within view	16.0	2.4
Out of sight	2.7	2.4
Global or undirected	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-45

MODE OF VIOLENCE BY TYPE OF VIOLENT INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
Body	24.6%	42.9%
Firearm	34.0	11.9
Hand weapon (non-firearm)	8.3	4.8
Normally non-violent objects	3.8	7.1
Vehicles	6.8	14.3
Explosives	5.3	2.4
Alcohol, Drugs	2.1	2.4
Nature	0.3	--
Other	<u>14.8</u>	<u>14.3</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-46

VISIBILITY OF PHYSICAL CONSEQUENCES OF VIOLENCE,
BY TYPE OF VIOLENT INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
Not shown	29.9%	52.4%
Slight visible consequences	21.9	14.3
Major visible consequences	41.7	21.4
Only subsequently revealed	<u>6.5</u>	<u>11.9</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-47

IMMEDIATE RESPONSE OF VICTIM OF VIOLENCE,
BY TYPE OF VIOLENT INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
Unable to respond	33.1%	26.2%
Submits	18.6	42.9
Withdraws	8.6	2.4
Resists violently	26.9	9.5
Flees	4.4	--
Attempts a solution	2.4	7.1
Mixed	1.5	2.4
Not clear	<u>4.4</u>	<u>9.5</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-48

DEATHS AS A RESULT OF VIOLENCE,
BY TYPE OF VIOLENT INCIDENT

	<u>Violent Conflict</u>	<u>Irrational Violence</u>
None	58.0%	76.2%
One only	29.3	7.1
Small number (2-5)	6.8	7.1
Moderate number (6-10)	0.3	--
Large number (over 10)	<u>5.6</u>	<u>9.5</u>
	100.0%	99.9%

D. Other Incidents

1. Arguments

Arguments were "verbal disagreements or oppositions [involving conflict and] often involving heated exchanges." While both initiators and responders were predominantly individuals, individuals were even more prevalent as initiators (Table IV-49).

As to the relationship between the parties to the argument, the incidents were rather widely spread among the relationship categories (Table IV-50). They took place most frequently between friends (27.4 per cent) and between spouses (21.0 per cent), and the three close relationships together accounted for 59.7 per cent of all arguments.

The single most frequent mode of interaction was accusation or blame (Table IV-51). Beyond that, a collection of disparate approaches ("other") was the next most frequent. A very large percentage of these modes were presented seriously with no humorous overtones (Table IV-52).

TABLE IV-49

INDIVIDUALITY OF ARGUMENT PARTICIPANTS

	<u>Initiator</u>	<u>Responder</u>
Individual	92.0%	88.0%
Group	<u>8.0</u>	<u>12.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-50

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ARGUMENT PARTICIPANTS

Marital	21.0%
Family	11.3
Friends	27.4
Authorities	10.4
Opponents	11.3
Strangers	12.1
Other	<u>6.5</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-51
MODE OF INTERACTION IN ARGUMENTS

Sarcasm	3.2%
Ridicule	6.4
Teasing	0.8
Mimicking	--
Accusation	64.0
Other	<u>25.6</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-52
HUMOUROUS OVERTONES TO MODE OF INTERACTION
FOR ARGUMENTS

Not present	77.6%
Comic element	<u>22.4</u>
	100.0%

2. Non-Violent, Non-Argument Conflicts

Non-violent, non-argument conflicts were disagreements which were handled by reasoned discussion. While this type of incident occurred most frequently with authorities, they were also prevalent with friends and with spouses (Table IV-53). Unlike arguments, distant relationships accounted for a slight majority of the rational discussions (51.6 per cent).

TABLE IV-53

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTIES TO NON-VIOLENT, NON-ARGUMENT CONFLICTS

Marital	14.5%
Family	3.7
Friends	25.8
Authorities	27.4
Opponents	11.3
Strangers	4.8
Other	<u>8.1</u>
	99.9%

3. Verbal Abuse

Verbal abuse differed from arguments in that it occurred outside of a conflict situation. Such incidents were basically those "in which one party harangue[d] or direct[ed] a tirade against another" in some sort of concerted fashion, and were not simply brief, off-hand comments.

This type of incident occurred most often between friends (especially colleagues at work), but were also prevalent with authorities and between spouses (Table IV-54). Verbal abuse was similar to arguments in that close relationships accounted for a substantial majority of them (62.9 per cent).

Again, as with arguments, accusation or blame was the most utilized mode of "attack," although ridicule and sarcasm were much more prominent than they were in arguments (Table IV-55). In addition, a much higher percentage of the incidents had a comic element added to them (Table IV-56).

TABLE IV-54

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTIES TO VERBAL ABUSE INCIDENTS

Marital	18.5%
Family	3.7
Friends	40.7
Authorities	22.2
Opponents	3.7
Strangers	7.4
Other	<u>3.7</u>
	99.9%

TABLE IV-55

MODE OF ATTACK IN VERBAL ABUSE INCIDENTS

Sarcasm	18.5%
Ridicule	29.6
Teasing	--
Mimicking	--
Accusation	44.4
Other	<u>7.4</u>
	99.9%

TABLE IV-56

HUMOUROUS OVERTONES TO MODE OF ATTACK IN

VERBAL ABUSE INCIDENTS

Not present	55.6%
Comic element	<u>44.4</u>
	100.0%

4. Harm to Self

Only those incidents in which characters purposely hurt, injured, mutilated or killed themselves were considered as "harm to self." These incidents were found to be evenly split in terms of centrality to the plot (Table IV-57).

Witnesses are present in the vast majority of cases, and while passive a majority of the time, they acted to encourage or assist in the harm to self more often than to prevent it (Table IV-58).

Vehicles, alcohol or drugs and "other" were the most popular modes employed (Table IV-59). Notably absent were the body and firearms, the two most popular modes used in violence towards others (Table IV-31).

Physical consequences of harm to self were always shown and were major in nature (Table IV-60), and were never undercut by humour. Somewhat curiously, however, despite the visibility of physical consequences, pain was relatively infrequent (but severe when it occurred) and there was little blood and gore presented (Table IV-61). This may be accounted for by the fact that the character "simply" failed to recover (Table IV-62).

TABLE IV-57

CENTRALITY OF HARM TO SELF INCIDENTS TO FILM PLOT

Incidental	50.0%
Central	<u>50.0</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-58

THE ROLE OF WITNESSES IN HARM TO SELF INCIDENTS

Not shown	16.7%
Passive	58.3
Assist or encourage	25.0
Attempt to prevent or restrain	<u>--</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-59

MODE EMPLOYED TO HARM SELF

Body	--
Firearms	--
Hand weapon (non-firearm)	--
Normally non-violent object	8.3%
Vehicles	25.0
Explosives	8.3
Alcohol, Drugs	25.0
Nature	8.3
Other	<u>25.0</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-60

VISIBILITY OF PHYSICAL CONSEQUENCES OF HARM TO SELF

Not shown	--
Slight visible consequences	16.7%
Major visible consequences	83.3
Only subsequently revealed	--
Not appropriate	--
	<hr/>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-61

DEGREE OF ILLUSTRATED PAIN AND ILLUSTRATED BLOOD AND GORE
IN HARM TO SELF INCIDENTS

	<u>Pain</u>	<u>Blood and Gore</u>
None	41.7%	75.0%
Moderate	8.3	8.3
Extreme	33.3	8.3
Not appropriate	<u>16.7</u>	<u>8.3</u>
	100.0%	99.9%

TABLE IV-62

RECOVERY FROM HARM TO SELF

Victim continues to function or recovers	33.3%
Incapacitated, restricted or dead	66.7
Consequences shown only subsequently	<u>--</u>
	100.0%

5. Destruction of Property

Destruction of property was coded when the property damaged or destroyed was of some significance (in terms of size or value), significant to the plot of the film or so presented stylistically as to be emphasized.

Over two-thirds of such incidents were intentional destructions (Table IV-63) and close to the same percentage occurred apart from violence (Table IV-64). Vehicles, explosives and the body were the most prevalent modes of destruction (Table IV-65).

6. Theft

Thefts were carried out by individuals in a majority of cases, although there were a large proportion of groups as well. The same proportion of incidents had individuals as victims (Table IV-66).

Most actual thefts occurred on-screen (Table IV-67), and the consequences to the victim of the theft were depicted more often than were the consequences to the thief (Table IV-68).

TABLE IV-63

INTENTIONALITY OF DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY

Intentional	69.8%
Unintentional	<u>30.2</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-64

OCCURRENCE OF DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY

Accompanies violence	36.5%
Occurs apart from violence	<u>63.5</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-65

MODE OF DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY

Body	22.6%
Firearm	--
Handweapon (non-firearm)	1.9
Normally non-violent object	1.9
Vehicles	26.4
Explosives	24.5
Alcohol, drugs	--
Nature	11.3
Other	<u>11.3</u>
	99.9%

TABLE IV-66

INDIVIDUALITY OF THIEVES AND THEIR VICTIMS

	<u>Thief</u>	<u>Victim</u>
Individual	58.3%	58.3%
Group	41.7	25.0
Institution	<u>--</u>	<u>16.7</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

TABLE IV-67

VISIBILITY OF THEFT

Occurred on-screen	75.0%
Occurred off-screen	<u>25.0</u>
	100.0%

TABLE IV-68

CONSEQUENCES TO THIEF AND VICTIM OF THEFT

	<u>Thief</u>	<u>Victim</u>
Depicted	41.7%	50.0%
Not Depicted	<u>58.3</u>	<u>50.0</u>
	100.0%	100.0%

E. Summary

In examining the general treatment of the incidents, some notable differences emerged between "physical" incidents and "verbal" incidents. While there was an overwhelming tendency for all incidents to be presented realistically, the physical incidents had a higher incidence of stylized presentation than did the verbal ones, destruction of property and violent conflict being the most pronounced in this regard. The differences between the presentation of physical and verbal incidents were more striking for detail of presentation: the physical incidents were presented in much less detail than the verbal ones, with little over a half of violent conflict incidents (56.6 per cent), 41.7 per cent of theft incidents and a mere 16.7 per cent of harm to self incidents being presented in great detail.

Violence was not completely gratuitous, at least in terms of its function in or centrality to the film. Violent conflict incidents were the most "essential" to the plot of all the incident types, but irrational violence was much more "ornamental," as were destruction of property and theft.

As to the settings of the incidents, most incidents were located in urban areas, small towns being the next most frequent locations and uninhabited areas having higher rates than suburban ones. This tended to hold across incident types, although small towns seemed to be comparatively popular places for violent conflicts, and especially for irrational violence and harm to self. Somewhat surprisingly, a large percentage of each type of incident occurred outdoors, and in line with the differences noted above, physical incidents took

place outdoors more frequently than did verbal ones. Close to half of violent conflict (49.3 per cent) occurred outdoors while irrational violence occurred in institutions 21.4 per cent of the time and in homes 16.7 per cent of the time. Other notable features about the settings of the incidents were the facts that violence (both conflictual and irrational) tended to be presented most often in non-North American locations, and that a majority of all incidents occurred during the daylight hours.

Some substantial differences (as well as certain similarities) were discovered among the means and ends of the different types of conflict. While the provocations and motivations of violence, arguments and rational discussion were all most often physical- and self-related, violence was most often characterized by the use of direct attacks and coercion and elimination to achieve goals, while both arguments and rational discussions were characterized predominantly by persuasion and avoidance. Violence was unjustified much more often than the other two forms of conflict were, and when justified, it was much more often in terms of defence and revenge than in moral and social terms (as arguments and rational discussions tended to be). In addition, the perpetrators of violence tended to display an attitude of coolness (as did the initiators of rational discussion, but to an even greater extent), anger being more the province of arguments. As to results, violence was an overwhelmingly effective means for achieving one's ends in violent conflict, while "rational discussions" were equally as likely to win through no violence and "arguers" were as likely to lose as win through no violence.

Violence incidents followed a rather regular "scenario" although there were a number of notable differences between the scenarios for violent conflict and irrational violence. Violence occurred most often between opponents, especially in violent conflicts, and close relationships (marital, family, friends) accounted for very little violence, although they were more prominent in incidents of irrational violence. Incidents of violence also tended to occur within the same national, ethnic or racial group.

Accomplices, witnesses and agents of the law were not terribly prominent in the violence incidents, being present in 50.5, 44.7 and 24.5 per cent of the violent incidents respectively. When present, however, accomplices tended to encourage violence, witnesses tended to be passive, and agents of the law tended to initiate or be targets of violence. The initiation of violence by agents of the law was even more pronounced in irrational violence, with the agents tending to act more often in unofficial capacities and to commit excessive violence.

Violence tended to be central to the plot, clearly intentional, presented in sinister contexts and mainly devoid of humourous overtones. Irrational violence was found to be more incidental than central, however, and to be more frequently accidental and less sinister in context.

Most violence took place in face-to-face situations and tended to catch the victim unawares. The body and firearms were the most popular "weapons," although irrational violence also employed vehicles rather frequently. The victims of violence most often were unable to respond, but when they were

able, tended to resist violently or submit in violent conflict and most often submitted in irrational violence. The results of the violence were fairly well-sanitized, with consequences often not revealed and little evidence of pain, of blood and gore, and of injury and death. In addition, most victims continued to function after the violence. The results of violence tended to be even more sanitized in the case of irrational violence.

As to the other types of incidents coded in the study, arguments occurred most frequently between friends and spouses, rational discussions most frequently with authorities and between friends and spouses, and verbal abuse most frequently between friends, with authorities and between spouses. All told, both arguments and verbal abuse occurred more frequently in close relationships than distant ones, while the opposite was true for rational discussions. Accusation and blame were the most common modes of attack in both arguments and verbal abuse, but ridicule and sarcasm were more prevalent in the latter, as were humourous overtones.

Harm to self incidents were found to be as incidental as they were central to the films, to have passive witnesses present in most cases, to employ vehicles, drugs and alcohol, and "other" modes most frequently, and to always reveal the consequences to the victim—but most often simply by showing that the individuals failed to recover rather than presenting pain and suffering in much detail.

Destruction of property was usually intentional, occurred apart from violence, and tended to be accomplished by the use of vehicles, explosives and the body. Finally, theft was most

often committed by individuals against individuals, with the consequences to the victim being depicted more often than the consequences to the thief.

ENDNOTES

¹In general terms, "an incident is defined as a symbolic (thematic) realm of motion confined to a single scene (time-space location) in which some agent(s) employ some means (agency) for some purpose (to achieve goal, overcome barrier) with some consequences." There were also rules to aid the coders in delineating and bounding incidents:

In order to establish the boundaries for the various incidents, employ the following rules:

- A. If the setting changes we have a new incident, except where there:
 1. is continuous action
 2. are dependent, related settings, even though they are physically or geographically apart. e.g. flashes between pursuer and pursued.
 3. is a telephone conversation (or similar communication). The setting is coded for the first place that appears.
- B. If the time-frame changes we have a new incident—even though the setting might be the same.
- C. In the case of violent conflict, if the receiver of violence responds with violence, we still have only one violent incident. In addition for the cases of violent conflict, lengthy shooting duels, fist fights and large-scale battle scenes would have to be regarded as one incident of violence provided that:
 1. the exchange is actually shown in total, and
 2. the interaction is continuous, i.e. without:
 - a) significant interruptions, and
 - b) significant changes in the way violence is exchanged.
- D. This latter point is of importance for all incidents. If a prolonged interaction is not continuous in the sense that major shifts in the style of interaction occur then the interaction has to be represented by more than one incident. Major shifts in the style of interaction can take the form of:
 1. a change in the method or means of interacting (e.g. an argument can escalate into a violent exchange, a violent interaction can escalate in terms of the weapons used)
 2. a change in initiative or aims pursued
 3. the introduction of a third party
 4. a change in the original parties involved.

- E. In addition, more than one type of incident or more than one instance of the same type of incident may occur simultaneously on the screen. For example, two parties—who are relatively independent of each other, and whose behaviour is not significantly co-ordinated, and hence cannot be considered a single group—may interact with different portions of a joint enemy. Or, when a third party becomes a source of violence without significantly affecting the nature of violent interaction between the first two parties, then the first encounter may be said to continue while a second encounter may have started at the point of the third party's entry.
- F. Flashbacks, flashforwards, dreams, fantasies, etc. are coded in the same manner as "real-time" incidents. Note prominently on the coding form that it is a flashback or whatever that is being dealt with.
- G. In dealing with arguments, if there is a conflict situation in which a character initiates what could be an argument and there is no initial response (for whatever reason) but later the second character involved in the "potential" argument revives the conflict, code as two incidents as follows:
 1. In the first incident, the first character is the INITIATOR and the second character is the RESPONDER.
 2. In the second incident, the second character is the INITIATOR and the first character is the RESPONDER.

²These categories of functions were derived from Clayton Hamilton, The Theory of the Theatre (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1910).

³These findings are almost opposite to those for television as discovered by George Gerbner, "Violence in Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions," in G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (ed.). Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 41:

The prevalence and rate of violence was lowest in an urban setting, higher in a small town or rural setting, and highest when the locale was uninhabited, mobile or not identified at all. The rate of violent episodes per play in remote or indistinct settings was twice that per play in urban settings. The social setting of the world of violence was half the time uninhabited or unidentifiable, while the world without violence was half urban and one-third small town or rural.

⁴The categories of "method of dealing with conflict" were adapted from Kenneth E. Boulding, Conflict and Defense: A General Theory (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 305-311. The original categories for "Method of Dealing with Conflict" were:

- 00 Unclear
- 01 Compliance to an equal
- 02 Compliance to an authority
- 03 Refusal (one party refuses to engage in conflict)
- 04 Conflict suspended (both parties refuse to engage in conflict)
- 05 Distract/deflection (something causes parties to turn attention elsewhere)
- 06 Reconciliation (achieve compatible preferences)
- 07 Compromise (each settles for less than original desires)
- 08 Arbitration (appeal to outsider to settle disagreement)
- 09 Coercion
- 10 One party elimination
- 11 Two party elimination

These categories are combined in Table IV-8 in the following manner:

- Avoidance (01, 02, 03, 04)
- Resolution (06, 07, 08)
- Distraction (05)
- Coercion (09)
- Elimination (10, 11)

⁵The original categorization for the dominant "Motivation/Stake in Outcome" of the initiator of the conflict encompassed 26 categories:

Hedonic Gain

- 01 Power
- 02 Material gain
- 03 Prestige; self-esteem
- 04 Personal pleasure
- 05 Survival
- 06 Freedom
- 07 Love
- 08 Loved ones
- 09 Fame
- 10 Sexual Reward

Avoidance of Hedonic Loss

- 11 Power
- 12 Material gain
- 13 Prestige; self-esteem
- 14 Personal pleasure
- 15 Survival
- 16 Freedom
- 17 Love
- 18 Loved ones
- 19 Fame

Avoidance of Ethical Loss

- 20 Legal social contract
- 21 Illegal social contract

- 22 Legal contract (signed document)
- 23 Moral obligation to self
- 24 Moral obligation to someone else
- 25 Religious contract
- 26 Mixed Avoidance (Hedonic and Ethical)

The categories in Table IV-9 were derived by combining the above original categories in the following fashion:

- Physical gain (02, 05, 10)
- Psychological gain (03, 09)
- Mixed gain (01, 04, 06, 07, 08)
- Physical avoidance (12, 15)
- Psychological avoidance (13, 19)
- Mixed physical and psychological avoidance (11, 14, 16, 17, 18)
- Social avoidance (20, 21, 22)
- Ethical avoidance (23, 24, 25)
- Mixed hedonic and social-ethical avoidance (26)

⁶The original categories of initiator's "provocation" for engaging in the conflict were:

Self-related

- 01 Physical
- 02 Psychological (insult, degradation, honour, prestige)
- 03 Security (financial, welfare, job-related)
- 04 Mixed

Other-related

Friends

- 05 Physical
- 06 Psychological
- 07 Security
- 08 Mixed

Family

- 09 Physical
- 10 Psychological
- 11 Security
- 12 Mixed

Society

- 13 Physical
- 14 Psychological
- 15 Security
- 16 Mixed
- 17 Mixed other-related
- 18 Mixed self- and other-related

For "Internal Source of Provocation," the following combinations were employed:

Physical (01, 05, 09, 13)
 Psychological (02, 06, 10, 14)
 Security (03, 07, 11, 15)
 Mixed (04, 08, 12, 16, 17, 18)

⁷For "External Source of Provocation," the original categories were combined as follows:

Self (01, 02, 03, 04)
 Friends (05, 06, 07, 08)
 Family (09, 10, 11, 12)
 Society (13, 14, 15, 16)
 Mixed (17, 18)

⁸There were a rather large number of original categories from which the three in Table IV-13 are derived. These were:

01 No justification

Explicit

Hedonic

02 Self-defence
 03 Avenge/revenge
 04 Mixed

Ethical

05 Moral obligation to self
 06 Moral obligation to others
 07 Mixed moral obligation
 08 Legal obligation
 09 Protection of innocent
 10 Mixed

11 Mixed hedonic and ethical

Implicit

Hedonic

12 Self-defence
 13 Avenge/revenge
 14 Mixed

Ethical

15 Moral obligation to self
 16 Moral obligation to others
 17 Mixed moral obligation
 18 Legal obligation
 19 Protection of innocent
 20 Mixed

21 Mixed hedonic and ethical

The method of combination of these were:

Defend-Revenge (02, 03, 04, 12, 13, 14)

Moral-Social (05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20)

Mixed (11, 21)

CHAPTER V
THE STYLISTIC TREATMENT OF VIOLENCE

A. The Study of Visual Style or Form in Film

Content analysis emerged as a method for studying linguistic material and continues to be applied primarily to the semantic aspect of written texts. In the common understanding of the term, "content" is the subject matter of a message or communication which is conveyed via manipulations of the characteristics of the particular medium employed. In other words, traditional content analysis tends to gloss over, if not ignore entirely, the contribution which form or style makes to the generation of meaning.

To deal adequately with the content of films, then, one would require an approach that would incorporate the study of such stylistic or formal elements. As Tudor has expressed it, it is impossible to talk about the effects of films until one has determined how meanings are created and conveyed by them.¹ An approach which attempts to go beyond consideration of subject matter alone is embodied in what Krippendorff has called the "discourse model."² The linguistic bias of this model becomes evident as well, however, when the semantic and syntactic components, and other linguistic requirements such as paraphrasing, are described. For as Tudor points out, the understanding of the communicative methods of film is nowhere near the point at which a true "grammar" or "language" of the cinema is possible.³

An alternate approach which attempts to cope with the stylistic elements, and has gained much currency in film study of late, is "structuralism." As de Camargo explains it, structuralism, "unlike content analysis, . . . is mainly concerned with the ways in which elements of the message are internally structured."⁴ Both methods attempt to find certain categories in the message, "but content analysis chooses these units empirically in light of particular needs, whereas structural analysis, proceeding by linguistic logic, seeks the irreducible basic unit which will enter into combinations that will have a meaning."⁵ This difference is normally described as the quantitative-qualitative distinction.

A further difference between the two approaches "relates to the levels of form and content."

Content analysis tends to look exclusively at separate items of content, rarely considering a framework common to both levels. "Structural Analysis proposes, on the contrary, such a framework in which the style is on the level of integration of content in the code from which it arises."⁶

The meaning of messages, then, is determined by the application of the conventions of a culturally-determined code, which operates at both the level of creation and reception. The goal of structuralism is to make this code and its operations explicit. In its concern with denotative and connotative meaning, structuralism is a variation of the discourse model.

Structuralism would seem to offer much promise for the study of meaning in films (and by extension the study of the "effects" of films as well).⁷ At the present stage, however, a large variety of structural approaches have only begun to be applied to the narrative dimensions of film sequences and

entire films,⁸ and to the thematic and the very vaguely conceived "stylistic" elements of large "bodies" of films.⁹ A more systematic approach to a more rigorous notion of style or form has not been able to get beyond the study of small portions of individual films.¹⁰ Since the desire here is to examine the possible impact of stylistic or formal elements for large numbers of films, a statistical approach has been adopted almost by default, despite Burgelin's assertion that stylistic and content elements must be studied within a framework which integrates them.¹¹

B. A Statistical Study of the Visual Style of Violence

The approach employed here is adapted from Barry Salt's attempt to compare the styles of various directors.¹² A greater number of variables has been examined here, however, than was the case in Salt's study. The ones selected for study are generally considered to be important communicative elements in film and they (and their categorizations) were derived from a number of standard filmmaking texts.¹³

Films were selected for a coding of all the shots included in each and every violent conflict and irrational violence incident.¹⁴ This entailed 192 incidents with a total of 1,472 shots. Each shot was coded on twelve variables.¹⁵

When the lengths of shots in violence incidents are examined, it is discovered that the average shot length was 3.1 seconds. This length is one third the average shot length that Salt discovered in his statistical study of directors' styles for American films in the thirties and forties.¹⁶ A study of the distribution of the shots for various length categories is even more revealing (Table V-1). A substantial 40.6 per cent of all the shots in violence incidents were one second or shorter in length, while a total of 87.6 per cent were 5 seconds or less in length, and a total of 96.0 per cent were 10 seconds or shorter. This distribution certainly deviates significantly from the Poisson distribution, which Salt feels most aptly describes the randomness of shot lengths in the works of directors.¹⁷ On that basis, one must conclude that shots in violence incidents are significantly shorter than those in non-violent portions of films.

The camera viewpoint employed almost exclusively in

TABLE V-1
 DISTRIBUTIONS OF SHOTS BY LENGTH OF SHOT
 (in Seconds)

1 or less	40.6%
2-5	47.0
6-10	8.4
11-15	2.0
16-20	0.8
21-25	0.6
26-30	--
31-35	0.1
36-40	0.1
41-45	0.2
46-50	--
51-55	--
56-60	--
61-65	--
66-70	--
71-75	0.1
Longer than 75	<u>0.1</u>
	100.0%

the "violent" incidents was "objective" (Table V-2). An objective viewpoint is similar to third-person narration in written material, while "subjective camera" is akin to first-person narration: it allows the viewer to perceive events directly through the eyes of a particular character.

Eye-level shots were almost as prevalent as the objective viewpoint (Table V-3), while the shots were distributed rather widely among the categories of scale of shot (Table V-4). Medium close-ups (27.9 per cent) were the most prevalent, followed by close-ups (21.7 per cent), then medium shots (14.3 per cent) and long shots (11.8 per cent). The combination of the three categories of close-up encompassed 57.2 per cent of all shots. These are shots which contain only that portion of the human figure from the waist up. Medium shots (giving a fuller but not complete view of the human figure) accounted for a further 22.2 per cent, and long shots (which present at least the full human form) the remaining 20.5 per cent.

In filmmaking, the gradation of tones or saturation of colours is referred to as "contrast." Table V-5 reveals that shots of violence tend to be predominantly medium in contrast, and when not medium, more often "flat" than "snappy." The shots were also mainly "medium" in terms of "lighting key" (i.e. the overall illumination of the shot) (Table V-6). When not medium, however, they were more low key (dark) than high key (bright).

The majority of the shots exhibited a great depth of focus (64.0 per cent) while most of the remainder (35.2 per cent) were characterized by sharp focus in one portion of the picture plane and soft focus in the remainder (Table V-7).

TABLE V-2

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY CAMERA VIEWPOINT OF SHOT

Subjective	1.6%
Objective	<u>98.4</u>
	100.0%

TABLE V-3

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY ANGLE OF SHOT

High Angle	5.1%
Eye-level	85.9
Low Angle	<u>9.0</u>
	100.0%

TABLE V-4

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY SCALE OF SHOT

Very long shot	8.7%
Long shot	11.8
Medium long shot	7.9
Medium shot	14.3
Medium close-up	27.9
Close-up	21.7
Big close-up	<u>7.6</u>
	99.9%

TABLE V-5

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY IMAGE CONTRAST

Snappy	1.4%
Medium	81.0
Flat	<u>17.6</u>
	100.0%

TABLE V-6

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY LIGHTING KEY

High key	1.0%
Medium	87.4
Low key	<u>11.6</u>
	100.0%

TABLE V-7

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY DEGREE OF FOCUS

Deep focus	64.1%
Shallow focus	35.3
Soft focus	<u>0.6</u>
	100.0%

Table V-8 demonstrates that, in virtually all the shots, action is depicted at the same rate at which it would occur in reality, while there is a very slight tendency to represent the action more slowly than it would occur in reality. The non-realistic treatment of "violence" (Table IV-1), then, must be derived more from stylized acting and other elements than from rate of depiction of action.

The overwhelming majority of shots were characterized by no movement of the camera at all (except perhaps slight panning or tilting movements to keep characters properly framed) (Table V-9). A small percentage of shots (9.8 per cent) involved some form of movement from a fixed camera position, while only 2.8 per cent involved actually moving the camera through space relative to the subject.¹⁸

TABLE V-8

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY NATURE OF ACTION

Freeze frame	0.4%
Slow motion	0.6
Normal	99.0
Accelerated	--
Mixed	--
	<hr/>
	100.0%

TABLE V-9

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY CAMERA MOVEMENT

No movement	86.7%
Optical movement	1.1
Regular pan	3.9
Swish pan	0.7
Tilt	2.3
Combination of pan and tilt	1.8
Tracking shot	2.8
Crane shot	--
Combination of stationary and moving	0.7
	<hr/>
	100.0%

Music is not employed to a significantly large extent in the "violence" shots. When it is used, however, it tends to be neutral or ominous (Table V-10) and average in intensity (Table V-11).

Finally, the "violence" shots all tend to be joined together by the use of direct or straight cuts (i.e. one shot is followed immediately by another, without the use of any optical effects) (Table V-12). The small incidence of fades and dissolves would occur, one would assume, at the beginning or end of "violent" sequences, perhaps most likely at the end, as the viewer is taken out of the scene of death and destruction.

This latter observation remains pure speculation, however, and highlights the major oversight of this analysis (one which it shares with Salt's study¹⁹). The statistical study of motion picture style is unable to account for editing, which is by common consensus one of the most powerful "tools" of the filmmaker's "trade." In fact, some feel editing is the defining characteristic of films, and the factor which allows it to be considered an art. At this stage, however, it is beyond the capabilities of the statistical analysis of style and, as Salt suggests, efforts should be made to develop methods to account for its impact, perhaps utilizing some form of Markov analysis or some method of pattern recognition. Nevertheless, the above findings represent some interesting and useful information about the stylistic treatment of violence, especially when considered in light of what empirical evidence exists concerning the "meaning" or "effects" of such variables.

TABLE V-10

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY NATURE OF MUSIC

No music	65.8%
Pastoral	0.8
Neutral	15.1
Ominous	<u>18.3</u>
	100.0%

TABLE V-11

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY INTENSITY OF MUSIC

No music	65.8%
Soft	6.4
Average	20.7
Loud	<u>7.2</u>
	100.1%

TABLE V-12

DISTRIBUTION OF SHOTS BY METHOD OF SHOT TRANSITION

Straight cut	99.6%
Fade	0.1
Dissolve	0.3
Wipe	--
Defocusing	--
Swish pan	<u>--</u>
	100.0%

C. Possible "Meanings" of the Stylistic Treatment of Violence

Studies of "meaning" in experimental aesthetics have tended to concentrate on the measurement of connotative meaning by use of the semantic differential, originally introduced by Osgood, Tannenbaum and Suci.²⁰ It has been discovered that the three major dimensions of meaning are evaluation, potency and activity, such dimensions having "reappeared in a wide variety of judgmental situations, particularly where the sampling of concepts has been broad."²¹ This approach has been applied to film in a number of studies while are "concerned with changes in meaning as a result of manipulation of filmic variables."²² One would have to agree with Pryluck's contention that such studies would have been more successful if they had been built on a more solid theoretical base. Nevertheless, the application of the findings of such studies to the data on the shots in the violence incidents does produce some interesting (if only suggestive) results.

The stylistic elements of the "typical" shot from a violent incident would combine to produce a shot which was: short; shot from a point of view external to the characters of the film; shot at eye level or below; basically a view of only the upper half of the human figure; normal to flat in terms of image contrast; medium to low key for lighting; in sharp focus for the most part; recorded at normal speed; virtually devoid of camera movement; often without background music; and almost invariably joined to the shots preceding and following it by means of a straight cut. Studies demonstrating that manipulations do produce differences in meaning

have been carried out for most of these variables or elements. A study of the interpretations of still photographs, for example, has demonstrated that the lower the angle of the camera to the subject, the more positive, stronger and active the subject is seen to be.²³ This phenomenon appears to be understood (at least implicitly) by photographers, on the basis of the study of their attempts to create certain impressions by manipulating various photographic variables.²⁴

Fosdick and Tannenbaum's data also suggests that larger images (i.e. manipulations of the scale of shot variable) are used to convey a sense of strength and activity.²⁵ It has also been suggested that close-ups can be used to increase the interest level of the viewer if they are not in opposition to the interest inherent in the subject matter.²⁶

While there appears to be no studies specifically on the topic of image contrast, there are a couple which deal with lighting contrast and it, along with the characteristics of the film stock itself, are the major determinants of image contrast. According to the findings of Fosdick and Tannenbaum, the medium to flat image contrast characteristic of the shots in violence would increase the evaluative meaning of the shots,²⁷ and according to Rose it would also make them seem more realistic.²⁸

As to the medium to low key lighting that the shots exhibited, Shoemaker's study would suggest that a certain sense of activity would be conveyed,²⁹ while Fosdick and Tannenbaum's work would suggest that both strength and activity would be evoked.³⁰

Music was not universally present, but it was employed

in slightly over a third of all shots. This use of music would further add to a sense of strength and activity involved in the violence, however, on the basis of what Tannenbaum has discovered about the impact of background music.³¹ It should be stressed, perhaps, that it is the mere presence of the music, regardless of its nature or intensity, which produced these results.

Other work has dealt with editing rhythms which, as was pointed out earlier, have not been dealt with directly in this study. Given the overwhelming tendency to use straight cuts and the rather small variation in length of shots in the incidents of violence (and also the predominance of short shots), it can be surmised that the editing of violent incidents approaches the "fast constant rates of cutting" which Penn has studied.³² Such cutting rates "can evoke the perception of more potency and activity in a film than slower rates of cutting."³³ In addition,

motion of objects in a film can be expected to affect the perception of potency and activity in a viewing audience. Motion may also be expected to evoke favorable evaluative meanings for films showing people.³⁴

Finally, the variables "viewpoint," "focus," "action" and "camera movement" do not seem to have been dealt with in experimental aesthetics. One would suspect, however, that the predominant objective viewpoint of the violence incidents would not be as suggestive of potency and activity as would a subjective camera approach. The reason for its heavy utilization may be the fact that the objective viewpoint more readily allows the filmmaker "to direct attention away from his own activity, to mask and displace it," and in so doing, more easily convey his guiding moral commentary.³⁵

As for the other variables, the tendency to deep focus and a normal rate of action may serve to increase a sense of realism, while the lack of camera movement may result in less distraction from the action within the frame itself.

The stylistic treatment of violence, then, would seem to create impressions of greater strength and activity (and at times, greater favourableness), while also suggesting greater realism.

ENDNOTES

¹Andrew Tudor, "Film and the Measurement of its Effects," Screen, Vol. 10, No. 4 and 5 (July/October, 1969), pp. 148-159.

²Klaus Krippendorff, "Models of Messages: Three Prototypes," in Gerbner, Holsti, Krippendorff, Paisley and Stone (ed.), The Analysis of Communication Content: Developments in Scientific Theories and Computer Techniques (New York: Wiley, 1969), pp. 73-78.

³Andrew Tudor, Image and Influence: Studies in the Sociology of Film (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974), pp. 106-107.

⁴Marina de Camargo, "Ideological Analysis of the Message: a bibliography," Working Papers in Cultural Studies, No. 3 (Autumn, 1972), p. 125.

⁵Edgar Morin, New Trends in the Study of Mass Communication. Occasional paper No. 7, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, 1968. Quoted in de Camargo, *ibid.*

⁶de Camargo, *ibid.*, p. 126. Quote is from Olivier Burgelin, "Structural Analysis and Mass Communications," Studies of Broadcasting, No. 8 (1968), p. 161.

⁷Not everyone is as hopeful about structuralism, or its somewhat related approach semiology—at least, as they have been employed to this point. See Brian Henderson, "Critique of Cine-Structuralism (Part I)," Film Quarterly, Vol. XXVI, No. 5 (Fall, 1973), pp. 25-34; "Critique of Cine-Structuralism (Part II)," Film Quarterly, Vol. XXVII, No. 2 (Winter, 1973-74) pp. 37-46; "Metz: Essais I and Film Theory," Film Quarterly, Vol. XXVII, No. 3 (Spring, 1975), pp. 18-33; and Bill Nichols, "Style, Grammar and the Movies," Film Quarterly, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3 (Spring, 1975), pp. 33-49.

⁸See, for example: Rene Gardies, "Structural Analysis of a Textual System," Screen, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Spring, 1974), pp. 11-31; Kari Hanet, "The Narrative Text of Shock Corridor," Screen, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Winter, 1974/5), pp. 18-28; Alan Williams, "The Circles of Desire: Narration and Representation in *La Ronde*," Film Quarterly, Vol. XXVI, No. 5 (Fall, 1973), pp. 35-41 and "Structures of Narrativity in Fritz Lang's *Metropolis*," Film Quarterly, Vol. XXVII, No. 4 (Summer, 1974), pp. 17-24.

⁹See, for example: Paul Willeman, "Towards an Analysis of the Sirkian System," Screen, Vol. 13, No. 4 (Winter, 1972/3), pp. 128-134; Peter Wollen, "The auteur theory," in Signs and Meaning in the Cinema (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1969); Jim Kitses, Horizons West (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1970); and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, Luschino Visconti (New York: Doubleday, 1968).

¹⁰See, for example: Raymond Bellour, "The Obvious and the Code," Screen, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Winter, 1974/5), pp. 7-17; Stephen Heath, "Film and System, Terms of Analysis, Part I," Screen, Vol. 16, No. 1 (Spring, 1975), pp. 7-77 and "Film and System, Terms of Analysis, Part II," Screen, Vol. 16, No. 2 (Summer, 1975), pp. 91-113; and Jacqueline Rose, "Writing as Auto-Visualization: Notes on a Scenario and Film of Peter Pan," Screen, Vol. 16, No. 3 (Autumn, 1975), pp. 29-53.

¹¹Burgelin, op. cit.

¹²Barry Salt, "Statistical Style Analysis of Motion Pictures," Film Quarterly, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1 (Fall, 1974), pp. 13-22.

¹³Lee R. Bobker, Making Movies: from script to screen (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973); Barry Callaghan, Film-making (London: Thames and Hudson, 1973); Lenny Lipton, Independent Filmmaking (San Francisco: Straight Arrow Books, 1972); J. Kris Malkiewicz, Cinematography: A Guide for Film Makers and Film Teachers (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1973); John Mercer, An Introduction to Cinematography, Second edition (Champaign, Illinois: Stipes, 1974); Edward Pincurs, Guide to Filmmaking (New York: Signet, 1969); Kenneth H. Roberts and Win Sharples, Jr., A Primer for Film-making: A Complete Guide to 16 mm and 35 mm Film Production (New York: Pegasus, 1971).

¹⁴The original plan was to code every shot of every violent conflict or irrational violence incident on the twelve variables for each and every film. Part way through the project (after six films had been coded) it became apparent that the coding of each and every film would be too time-consuming. As a result, a random sample of four films was selected from the remaining 14 non-Canadian films, while it was decided that the entire Canadian sample of five films would be so coded. The latter decision was based on the desire to compare the stylistic treatment of violence in Canadian and non-Canadian films. Since the order of coding for the first six films (and all other films as well) was determined strictly on the basis of film availability, the full ten non-Canadian films coded for stylistic treatment can be considered a valid random sample. The 15 films for which the shots of the violent conflict and irrational violence incidents were coded were: The Nickel Ride, The Towering Inferno, Mahogany, Death Race 2000, French Connection II, Murder on the Orient Express, Doc Savage, Man of Bronze, The Odessa File, Funny Lady, Three Days of the Condor, Sunday in the Country, Sudden Fury, Wings in the Wilderness, Lies My Father Told Me and My Pleasure is My Business.

¹⁵For a description of where the coding of shots fitted into the entire process, see Appendix B (3), "Analysis Procedures."

¹⁶Salt, op. cit., p. 21. One would assume that this figure is smaller for modern films, but is probably still

nowhere near the average shot length for violence incidents.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁸A shot in which "the camera was rigidly fixed relatively to the actors, the background behind them moving, e.g., an actor filmed in a car," was not coded as one in which there was movement. Ibid., p. 13.

¹⁹Salt is quite aware of this shortcoming. Ibid., p. 20.

²⁰Charles Osgood, Percy Tennenbaum and George Suci, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

²¹Ibid., p. 325.

²²Calvin Pryluck, Sources of Meaning in Motion Pictures and Television (New York: Arno Press, 1976), p. 11.

²³Donald H. Shoemaker, "An Analysis of Three Vertical Camera Angles and Three Lighting Ratios on the Connotative Judgments of Three Human Models." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1974.

²⁴James A. Fosdick and Percy H. Tannenbaum, "The Encoder's Intent and Use of Stylistic Elements in Photographs," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 41, No. 2 (Spring, 1974), pp. 175-182.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Robert C. Williams, "Film Shots and Expressed Interest Levels," Speech Monographs, Vol. XXXV (June, 1968), pp. 166-169.

²⁷Fosdick and Tannenbaum, op. cit.

²⁸Ernest D. Rose, "Credibility and the Realist Tradition in Cinema," The Journal of the University Film Association, Vol. 24, No. 4 (1972), p. 111.

²⁹Shoemaker, op. cit.

³⁰Fosdick and Tannenbaum, op. cit. In an earlier study of the effect of lighting angle, they suggested that lighting key, in fact, may have been the critical variable in the results they obtained. Percy H. Tannenbaum and James A. Fosdick, "The Effect of Lighting Angle on the Judgment of Photographed Subjects," A-V Communication Review, Vol. 8, No. 6 (November-December, 1960), pp. 253-262.

³¹Percy H. Tannenbaum, "The Effects of Background Music on Interpretation of Stage and Television Drama," A-V Communication Review, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Spring, 1956), pp. 92-101.

³²Roger Penn, "Effects of Motion and Cutting-Rate in Motion Pictures," AV Communication Review, Vol. 19, No. 1

(Spring, 1971), pp. 29-50.

³³Ibid., p. 45.

³⁴Ibid., p. 49.

³⁵Nick Browne, "The Spectator-in-the-Text: The Rhetoric of Stagecoach," Film Quarterly, Vol. XXIX, No. 2 (Winter, 1975-76), p. 35.

CHAPTER VI

POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF FEATURE FILM CONTENT

A. A Model or Theory of the Film Viewing Experience

When one is concerned with making statements about either the sources or resultant consequences of the messages under study, one has moved beyond the realm of descriptive content analysis and into the area of inferential content analysis.¹ In the process of making inferences about effects, as will be done here, the empirical observations of the study are combined with assumptions or theories based on knowledge about related phenomenon. In the case of film, and this study in particular, one must have some more or less explicit notion of the various factors involved in the audio-visual situation which is filmviewing, the "language" which films employ and the cultural conventions surrounding films.²

The special characteristics of the film viewing experience, especially its supposed similarity to prehypnotic or dream-like states, have long been remarked upon.³ These characteristics have been invoked more recently for the comparison of filmviewing to the viewing situation of television.⁴ It has been claimed that the darkened theatre, with the heightened intensity of message stimuli and increased sense of social isolation that it creates, and the relaxed posture of the film viewer, combine to make the message more emotionally potent and the viewer more susceptible emotionally to such stimuli.⁵ While the differences between the viewing

experiences of the two media may not be as great as Tudor imagined them,⁶ it seems fairly clear that there is a large element of emotional communication involved in films.

Films are also characterized by the predominance of the "story film," or the "traditional narrative" as it has come to be known. Films can (and do) encompass a wide range of techniques, styles and subject matters, from cinema verite documentaries to abstract films emphasizing colour, shape, rhythm and so on. The most widely exhibited and most popular films, however, tend to be the ones which have "stars" playing characters who become involved in events that are strung together in a basically chronological order, such a chronological framework normally being referred to as "the plot."⁷ Furthermore, these traditional narratives are structured according to classical dramatic principles: the opening exposition gives way to the complication, in which the problem or difficulty central to the narrative is unfolded, and the situation is finally turned to the favour of the forces of good at the climax, after which the loose ends of the plot thread(s) are tied together rather rapidly in the denouement. In other words, narrative films employ the curve of rising and falling action, and have a definite beginning, middle and end, which (unlike Jean Luc Godard's dictum) occur in that order.⁸

The object of the filmmaker, then, becomes one of persuading the viewer to cross the distance that separates spectator from screen and to imaginatively enter the space of the screen world, experiencing vicariously the events that occur within that world.⁹ This is where the emotional aspect of film becomes important. The vicarious involvement affects the viewer

both physiologically and emotionally. For example, as the unidentified man carrying a knife stalks the unsuspecting young woman through the jagged patterns of shadow and light in the deserted city streets, the viewer experiences fear for the fate of the unsuspecting young woman and his heartrate increases, his palms may become sweaty and so on.

How is this vicarious involvement in the flow of events obtained? There are two principal factors involved: displacement of attention from medium to message (if you will) and identification with stars, characters, story-types and situations.

The desire to have the spectator "enter" the film (to a certain extent at least) can probably account for the narrative form's attraction to the filmmaker and for the particular manner in which the narrative is presented. John Fell believes that "in the motion pictures there surfaced an entire tradition of narrative technique which had been developing unsystematically for a hundred years."¹⁰ The narrative form had originally "developed to guarantee unflagging interest by omitting the 'dead spots' of other drama, enlisting identifications with the performers and refining resources of suspense."¹¹

There is also something rather significant about the relationship between the two aspects of the narrative. Hanet delineates these aspects by applying the approach of Genette to the narrative structure of films.¹² A narrative film is a combination of "what is being told" (i.e. the story or the plot) and the "how of the telling" (i.e. the process or method of narration). A central characteristic of narrative films, in this regard, is their general tendency to mask their process of narration in favour of emphasizing the plot or story. The

conscious aim of the narrative film, then, is "to eliminate intrusive camera presence and prevent a distancing awareness in the audience. . . . [Without such an approach] fictional drama cannot achieve reality, obviousness and truth."¹³

Film technology, and the particular ways in which it is employed in narrative films, contributes greatly to this masking of the method of narration. As Mulvey observes:

Camera technology (as exemplified by deep focus in particular) and camera movements (determined by the action of the protagonist), combined with invisible editing (demanded by realism) all tend to blur the limits of screen space.¹⁴

In other words, the action of the actors is so orchestrated, the images are so composed and photographed, and the shots are so joined together in the editing process that no attention or notice is focused upon the technical and stylistic means used to achieve certain responses. All these elements are transparent, then.¹⁵ With his intention riveted on the story, the viewer is deeply involved with the characters in the film and in the sequence of situations in which these characters find themselves.

This brings us to a consideration of the second basic factor involved in the viewer's bridging of the space between himself and the screen: identification. Identification is a notion which has been invoked in various guises in film theory from its earliest beginnings.¹⁶ Unfortunately, however, there have been very few empirical attempts to study the dynamics of the phenomenon (in media generally as well as in film specifically) and pronouncements have tended to remain at the level of speculation.¹⁷ Generally, "identification" has been conceptualized as "putting oneself in the place of" or "empathizing with" one or more characters in the film. It

has been "measured by indications of emotional attachment or liking,"¹⁸ and two principal forms which have been recognized are similarity identification and wishful identification.¹⁹ In the former, the viewer identifies with those characters most like himself, while in the latter, identification occurs with those whom the viewer desires to be like.

The phenomenon is probably much more complicated than most theoretical formulations have presented it, and the typology presented by Tudor is most useful in this regard.²⁰ Two types of "star-individual identification" are combined with two different "consequences" to produce a four-fold classification: emotional affinity, self-identification, imitation (of physical and simple behavioural characteristics) and projection. "Emotional affinity" is the weakest and probably the most common, and Tudor describes it as follows:

The audience feels a loose attachment to a particular protagonist [or possibly antagonist?] deriving jointly from star, narrative and the individual personality of the audience member: a standard sense of involvement.²¹

This form of identification is "subject to rapid and extensive variation," Tudor claims.

The next strongest category is "self-identification," in which "the audience-member places himself in the same situation and persona of the star." "Imitation," the third category, is most prevalent among the young. In this form of involvement, "consequences are no longer limited to the immediate cinema-going situation, the star acting as some sort of model for the audience."²² This category shades over into the final, most intense and diffuse form of involvement: projection. In this form, "the person lives his or her life in terms bound up with the favoured star." The star, in effect,

"becomes a receptacle for the projected desires, frustrations, and pleasures of the fan."²³ Projection seems to be most prevalent in adolescents, a group which is "most likely to grasp at the models provided by the star-system as a way of forming a sense of identity and a social reality."²⁴ It also seems that this approach is more prevalent among female rather than male adolescents.

Tudor observes that there are also elements of involvement with story-type although it is almost solely at the level of emotional affinity. Such involvement is realized through the existence of film genres.

To see a movie made within a clearly recognised genre, such as the western or the horror movie, is to participate in a familiar locale and development, and this familiarity facilitates easy and immediate involvement.²⁵

The individual star (as well as the story-type to a certain extent) is clearly important, then, in integrating the film viewer into the screen world. It is not always the case, however, that a genuine "star" is present in a film, but that does not mean that identification does not occur. Filmviewers also identify with non-celebrity actors as a result of the actor's characterization of an individual immersed in specific situations. (Quite probably there is an element of this in identifications with celebrities as well.) It is in this regard that one must study such things as point-of-view since its structure "is a mechanism whereby we experience contemporaneously with a character."²⁶

An even more interesting formulation is provided by Nick Browne. To the triangle of spectator position, camera point of view and a character's perspective (i.e. the normal notion of identification), one must add an identification "with

a character's position in a certain situation." This means that

The way we as spectators are implicated in the action is as much a matter of our position with respect to the unfolding of those events in time as in their representation from a point in space.²⁷

And ultimately, Browne claims, the structures through which the spectator is so implicated in the action "convey and are closely allied to the guiding moral commentary of the film." In other words, the meaning which a film conveys operates in the moral, normative or ideological realm. Such an observation corresponds closely to Franklin Fearing's old but still relevant conclusion that the two main generalizations about the "effects" of movie content that seem justified are:

any film . . . has some measurable effects on specific attitudes of those exposed to it, provided a measuring instrument (e.g. attitude scale) is devised for it, and provided the audience is sufficiently interested to give it sustained attention.

and

films . . . assist the individual in structuring his world.²⁸

The sustained attention to which Fearing refers is created in film by the phenomenon of "identification." As described above, this identification is created by involvement with stars, characters, story-types and situations, and is facilitated by story-telling techniques which conceal themselves from the viewer. In this situation the viewer is unaware or unconscious of the many things which are happening to him as he watches. This unawareness is further heightened by the entertainment ethic which surrounds film (and most other media as well). Movies are light, somewhat frivolous and unimportant, and are opportunities for people to escape the

cares of everyday life, or find satisfaction for "various latent needs or predispositions."²⁹ In such a relaxed and receptive state, the viewer is susceptible to new attitudes, beliefs and values dealing with those areas of life about which he has no strong pre-existing ones, or with which he has little or no experience, and for the reinforcement of those which he already holds strongly—both areas in which mass communications are accepted to be the most potent.³⁰

B. The Audience and the Sociology of Filmviewing

While attention has been concentrated on the psychological nature of the filmviewing experience thus far, a full understanding of that experience requires an examination of its sociological nature as well. Unfortunately, there are very few comprehensive studies of movie audiences. This fact can probably be attributed to a combination of a lack of academic interest in the subject (given the prominence of television) and Hollywood's skepticism about the usefulness of such research except in times of desperation.³¹

It has been fairly well-established, nonetheless, that young people comprise a disproportionately large segment of the movie audience and have done so for many years.³² In fact, the data would suggest that film attendance approximates a curvilinear relationship with age: film attendance is high for adolescents and young adults and tends to decline in increasing proportions as one moves towards old age (Table VI-1). While data on childrens' film attendance is not frequently gathered in any systematic fashion, what little that does exist suggests that their rates of attendance are very low.³³ The film attendance pattern by age, then, is virtually a mirror-image of the rate of television viewing by age.³⁴ Most specifically, adolescents and young people tend to watch less television and attend more movies than do either children or older people.

Tudor concedes that such data confirms the popular belief about the relationship between youthfulness and movie attendance, but claims that other popular beliefs about the influence of sex, economic class and education on viewing

TABLE VI-1

UNITED STATES

AGE OF MOTION PICTURE AUDIENCES, 1976

<u>Age</u>	<u>Percent of Total Yearly Admissions</u>		<u>Percent of Population</u>	
12-15 years]	14	45	10	22
16-20 years]	31		12	
21-24 years]	15	44	9	34
25-29 years]	16		10	
30-39 years]	13		15	
40-49 years]	5	8	13	26
50-59 years]	3		13	
60 and Over	<u>3</u>		<u>18</u>	
	100		100	

Source: Opinion Research Corporation, Incidence of Motion Picture Attendance, Study for the Motion Picture Association of America, 1976.

rates do not hold true.³⁵ Perhaps part of the problem here stems from the tendency to conceptualize the audience in rather monolithic terms. Gans notions of "publics" is useful in helping to clarify the situation:

The audience for each movie can be classified into a large number of publics, each public being an aggregate of people who have made a choice with the same pre-disposition, or a set of related predispositions. Every ticket-buyer will respond to several themes in a single movie, and thus "belongs" to a number of publics. Moreover, since he will look for different gratifications in a musical than in a western, he will "belong" to a different set of publics for every type of movie. The total potential movie audience is thus composed of innumerable publics, and every movie attracts a distinctive combination of them.³⁶

More recently Gans has swung away from a perspective that suggests a large element of "communicative anarchism" (at least as expressed in the above quotation) to an analysis which posits the existence of five distinct and fairly stable "taste publics [which] are defined primarily in terms of shared aesthetic values."³⁷

While Gans allows that there are many examples of "cultural straddling" (i.e. making content choices from taste cultures far removed from one's usual taste culture), he posits that the taste publics and cultures are quite stable overall. And among the plethora of socioeconomic and personality factors "which translate themselves into wants for specific types of cultural content . . . the major source of differentiation between taste cultures and publics is socioeconomic level or class . . . [and] [a]mong the three criteria that sociologists use most often to define and describe class position—income, occupation and education—the most important factor is education (by which I mean, here and elsewhere, not only schooling but

also what people learn from the mass media and other sources)
" ³⁸

Among the five taste publics which he delineates (as regards their choices among film content) the "high culture" favours foreign and "art" films and often "shares" these with the upper-middle culture who also frequent "the 'independent' productions that now come out of Hollywood." "Lower-middle audiences remain loyal to American films, although they may go to see only big musicals and other spectaculars," ³⁹ while low culture members are attracted to the sexual segregation, working-class values and clear cut issues of the Hollywood action films. ⁴⁰ And finally, the films of the quasi-folk low culture are "old Westerns and adventure stories now shown only in sidestreet movie houses in the slums." ⁴¹

While Gans' notion of taste cultures and publics, as they relate to film, requires more study and testing, there are some indications that the phenomenon does exist. Anast, for example, found a distinct difference in movie attendance, amount of movie-related fantasy and hero-heroine saliency between students with high and those with low adventure and/or achievement interest. ⁴² In addition, there were some large differences between males and females, the most notable for our purposes being the fact that "the greatest sex difference was found in the violence-attendance relationship, where females accounted for a near zero correlation in contrast with males." ⁴³ Anast's theoretical explanation of the results are interesting given what has been said above concerning the psychology of the filmviewing experience:

personality needs underlying adventure and achievement interests incite a higher action potential level than do needs propelling the other four interests [love, violence, luxury and mishaps]. Needs with high action potential require direct expression and cannot easily be appeased vicariously.

According to this line of reasoning, strong vicarious interests in love, violence, mishaps and luxury can more easily be satisfied by substitution than adventure and achievement can, hence greater movie attendance on the part of those with high interests in the former . . . Reliance on vicarious outlet through the movies must be described as passive and dependent.^{4 4}

Gans' notion of taste publics also resonates with what little is known of the economic operations of the film industry. It seems to be the case that investors can earn a very large rate of return on their investment on the occasional big film and can earn a modest return on most "small" films. It is the films between these extremes that are the biggest risks and the most frequent losers at the box office. The small film would be tailored to the interests of a particular taste public, then, while the "high budget spectacular films . . . try to provide something for every numerically important subculture."^{4 5}

It is within this framework of psychological and sociological factors, then, that the possible effects of feature film content described herein must be considered.

C. Film and the Range of Its "Effects"

As the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) has observed, "In the past twenty-five years, literally thousands of research studies on the effects of television and film have been published."⁴⁶ Following Halloran, however, the CRTC is able to reduce this mass of information into a comprehensible form by focusing on six broad, recurrent themes: catharsis, arousal, desensitization, imitation, the learning of violence as a value (violence succeeds) and perceptions of a violent environment. These themes are similar to the ones presented earlier by the Royal Commission,⁴⁷ and a combination of these lists will be utilized as a framework for the discussion of the possible effects of feature film content.

1. Catharsis Versus Arousal/Aggression

The most consistent debate with regard to the effects of viewing media violence revolves around the question as to whether such viewing heightens and increases aggressive tendencies, or rather provides a vicarious outlet for such tendencies, thereby reducing them. Recent studies have tended to indicate that the arousal/aggression hypothesis is more tenable, with the result that the catharsis theory has tended to be discredited, if not dismissed entirely.⁴⁸

Goranson asserts that "the whole idea of vicarious aggression catharsis stems from a misunderstanding of Aristotle's original conception of catharsis."⁴⁹ Aristotle's use of the concept was confined to the "tragic" feelings of sorrow and anguish. In this regard, Goranson notes that:

There is of course a crucial difference between sorrow and aggression with respect to the concept of vicarious catharsis. Performance of a tragedy in the ancient theatres of Greece or in modern day films or television can serve to stimulate or trigger off actual weeping or crying in the viewer—the overt expression of aroused feelings. Observed violence may similarly arouse feelings of aggressiveness, but these feelings cannot be given immediate expression either in the theater or the home. These feelings must be inhibited, "bottled up," until they subside or until an acceptable or available target can be found.⁵⁰

While it is difficult to support the catharsis theory as it has been presented, there are a number of questions about the arousal/aggression theory which raise the possibility that too many unwarranted assumptions have been made about the nature of the viewing experience. The bulk of the studies upon which the arousal/aggression theory are based are controlled laboratory experiments, involving rather contrived viewing experiences as well as subsequent measures of aggression.

The stimulus materials for most of these studies have been very brief film clips.⁵¹ The use of such materials would seem to ignore the fact that present-day films are on average close to two hour experiences which are highly structured according to the rising and falling curve of dramatic action. This lack of attention to the structural characteristics of film stimuli has been pointed out by Seymour Feshbach (who it must be remembered, of course, has been the principle proponent of the catharsis theory). In commenting on his discovery of greater aggression as a result of exposure to a newsreel than to a fictional film on the same topic, Feshbach suggests that:

when an event is fictional, subjects can "leave their feelings in the theater," as it were; or, if these feelings linger, they are focused on the dramatic event. The "message" of a newsreel, however, goes beyond the

context in which the film is observed. By definition, the newsreel has meaning for events beyond the theater or living room. As an alternate to the displacement hypothesis, we suggest that the observation of socially approved or otherwise reinforced "real" violence, through secondary reinforcement, reduction in anxiety, and imitation, generalizes to real aggressive behavior. . . .⁵²

This suggestion is of considerable interest given our finding that films are overwhelmingly (80 per cent) closed narratives. In addition it raises the possibility that open narratives may not short circuit aggressive tendencies in such a manner. This phenomenon is of special interest since Hanneman's work suggests that high stimulus uncertainty (which a failure to "round off" the narrative most likely engenders in the average viewer) leads to greater arousal than low stimulus uncertainty when the stimulus is violent.⁵³ In the average film, however, the structure of the experience and the time over which it is "orchestrated," may allow any aggressive tendencies engendered during the film to "subside" within the course of the viewing experience itself. And without being an apologist for the media, it is possible to allow that even if one discounts the catharsis theory, there is the possibility that fantasy "may act as a cognitive control over the expression of aggressive impulses."⁵⁴ The important point is that the nature of the experience itself cannot be ignored. As Feshbach expresses it,

studies attempting to describe more precisely the psychological effects of the fantasy set orientation are required. There is a considerable gap between exposure to an aggressive film, whether under a reality or a fantasy orientation, and the measures of the child's subsequent aggressive behavior. To fill the gap requires a more profound and detailed knowledge of the dramatic experience than is currently available.⁵⁵

2. Desensitization

The above suggestion, that the direct behavioural effects of viewing film violence should be tempered somewhat, should not be construed to mean that violence in films has no "effects." It does mean, however, that the more pervasive effects of such portrayals are probably more subtle and diffused than the notion of direct behavioural effects would concede.

Desensitization or tolerance would be one such area, since popular films contain a large amount of violence (although less than not-so-popular films).⁵⁶ This effect would be even more pronounced among what Gans calls the "low culture" taste public,⁵⁷ given their attraction to action films which, we have seen, are particularly violent. The impact would not be restricted to that taste public, however, given the way in which popular elements from various taste cultures (in this case violence) tend to be aggregated in film "block busters," in order to appeal to large, heterogeneous audiences.

Given that studies have suggested that such a phenomenon exists,⁵⁸ movies would seem to contribute to our expectation of and tolerance of "violence in society as inevitable, normal or even appropriate."⁵⁹ This would seem to be confirmed by Renner's study.⁶⁰

3. Imitation

Much attention is focused on instances of what seem to be direct imitation of behaviour depicted in movies, especially when such behaviour is particularly unusual or violent. In order to fully appreciate the issues involved, however, it is again necessary to refer to the nature of the viewing situation.

A crucial element in filmviewing is the process of identification. The extent of identification can vary from superficial "emotional affinity" all the way to "projection." A related phenomenon is the perception of the simulation of reality involved in the films. So, for example, if a person were to identify strongly with a character who commits excessive violence or engages in some bizarre behaviour in a film, and that same person experiences difficulty in differentiating the fantasy of the film from the reality of the social world, there is a strong possibility that the person will imitate the behaviour he has observed on the screen.

It is interesting to note, in this regard, that the more intensive forms of identification are prevalent among teenagers, who represent a considerable proportion of the film audience. In addition, younger children may be vulnerable as well, given their somewhat greater difficulty in distinguishing between the versimiltude of film fantasy and reality.⁶¹ Adults with difficulties in relating to reality may also be susceptible to such effects. While not wanting to belittle the difficulties and dangers created by these conditions, perhaps a more fruitful approach is afforded by asking why so few individuals directly imitate the often bizarre behaviours they observe on movie screens.⁶²

4. Violence Succeeds

There have been studies which suggest that "children may be almost as likely to imitate an aggressive character who 'gets away with it' as they are an actor who is explicitly rewarded for his aggression."⁶³ In addition, "when in an

attempt to show that crime does not pay there is violent retribution, its main effect is still to teach that violence is the way to solve problems."⁶⁴

When the films are examined as to the ways in which conflict is handled, it can be seen that violence is both a frequent form of conflict and an effective means of achieving one's goals. There were almost five-and-a-half as many violent incidents as there were non-violent, non-argument incidents (rational discussions) and over two-and-a-half as many violent conflicts as arguments. Moreover, while arguments and rational discussions involved persuasion and some form of avoidance to deal with the conflict, violent conflict entailed direct attacks in 91.7 per cent of the cases and also relied heavily on elimination and coercion to "resolve" the conflict. As to results, in 72.6 per cent of the violent conflict incidents, the initiator of the conflict was a winner through his own violence. Initiators of arguments were winners through no violence 49.1 per cent of the time, while initiators of rational discussions had the highest rate of success (74.3 per cent) through no violence. This success rate is undercut, however, by the fact that rational discussions occur so much less frequently than violence.

This high rate of success for violence initiators, combined with the fact that characters who deserved punishment escaped it one-third of the time (with even higher rates for protagonists), would seem to indicate that the films "teach" violence as a value.

5. Images of "Reality"

Given the receptive emotional and physical state of the filmviewer and the uncritical viewpoint which the transparent methods of filmmaking tend to induce, films are quite possibly the source of a great amount of incidental learning, most of which takes place below the level of consciousness (and perhaps more powerful as a consequence).

a) Stereotypes

There is ample evidence of stereotyping with regard to many groups in the films. Women, for example, are outnumbered by men by a rate of over four to one. When presented they tend to fit the traditional notion of the attractive but basically submissive female. While few female characters are housewives, they tend to be located in the less exciting occupations as compared to men. Old people and politicians are similarly presented in a fashion that tends to galvanize conventional stereotypes. Even men fail to escape a "macho" image.

Perhaps the most interesting group in this regard is teenagers. As has been pointed out earlier, the characters in the films tended to be concentrated heavily in the adult and middle-age categories. This situation contrasts sharply to the fact that teenagers constitute the single largest age group in the movie audience and are the most frequent attenders. Even more anomalous is the fact that teenagers tend to be portrayed negatively on most attributes (power, competence and so on) but are presented as the most satisfied group of all. One cannot help but wonder if the movies do not serve, at one and the same time, the functions of reconciling teenagers to their present status and providing role models to "grow into."

b) Perceptions of a Violent Environment

Studies have tended to demonstrate that large amounts of television viewing (and hence exposure to large amounts of violence) have lead to exaggerated estimates of the amount of crime and violence in society and of the kinds of risks and dangers that individuals face.⁶⁵ Doob and Macdonald's study for the Commission, however, would seem to indicate that there are a complex of factors involved which suggests the connection between amount of viewing and exaggeration of danger is perhaps not as simple and direct as originally hypothesized.⁶⁶

On the face of it, it would appear that the films are rather violent (an average violence rating of 4.4 out of 7 and an average of 15.2 violence incidents per film), although there are really no yardsticks against which to measure this rate of portrayal. It would not be unreasonable, then, to expect movie viewers to exhibit a certain amount of distortion with regard to estimates of crime and violence, with the low culture taste public reporting even higher over-estimates given their inordinate exposure to violence via action films. On the contrary, however, Renner reports that frequent moviegoers are less likely to over-estimate the actual amount of crime in the Toronto area than are those who attend movies infrequently.⁶⁷ This situation may be a result of the fact that frequent movie attenders watch less television (which could be the more potent source of distortion) or as is more likely the case, movie attendance is related to a cluster of socio-economic variables whose influences on such over-estimates of actual crime have yet to be sorted out.

c) Victimization and Observation of Violence

Just as films can provide role models for perpetrators of violence, so too can they provide models for victims of and witnesses to violence. In terms of the immediate response of the victim of violence (in those two-thirds of all cases in which the victim could respond), the most frequent response was violent resistance with submission being a close second. Witnesses were present in just less than 45 per cent of the incidents, and when present their dominant reaction was passivity. If they acted at all, they more often assisted in or encouraged violence than acted to prevent, restrain or seek alternatives to violence.

In conclusion, then, the model of the filmviewing experience subscribed to (which has yet to be demonstrated as completely empirically valid) when applied to the findings of the study suggests that films are more important for their more indirect perceptual and attitudinal effects than for their direct behavioural ones. The arousal/aggression and catharsis controversy requires greater attention to the response factors surrounding the dramatic experience of closed narratives, while imitation would seem to be an aberrant case of over-identification and difficulty in differentiating fantasy from reality. The more pervasive effects would appear to be in the area of increasing desensitization, teaching violence as a value, galvanizing social stereotypes and providing role models for victimization and the witnessing of violence.

ENDNOTES

¹Ole R. Holsti, Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and the Humanities (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969), pp. 68-93.

²Andrew Tudor, "Film and the Measurement of its Effects," Screen, Vol. 10, No. 4 and 5 (July/October, 1969), pp. 148-159.

³Hugo Munsterberg, The Photoplay: A Psychological Study. 1915. Reprint (New York: Dover Publications, 1970).

⁴Tudor, op. cit., pp. 152-153. See also John Russell Taylor, "Movies for a Small Screen," Sight and Sound, Vol. 44, No. 2 (Spring, 1975), p. 114 and Bruce Cook, "Why TV Stars Don't Become Movie Stars (And on the other hand, some movie stars don't do too well on television.)," American Film, Vol. 1, No. 8 (June, 1976), pp. 58, 60.

⁵Tudor, op. cit., p. 152.

⁶John Russell Taylor notes, for example, that although there is a tendency toward distraction in television viewing which leads to "a more diffused kind of attention, . . . it is easy in contrast to over-emphasise the magical hold the large glittering screen has on an audience's attention in the comforting womb—like darkness of the cinema." Op. cit., p. 114. The authors have also noted from personal experience an increased tendency of movie audiences to exhibit what has normally been considered appropriate television viewing behaviour but inappropriate movie viewing behaviour (e.g. making loud remarks, conversing continuously, etc.) It has been pointed out by Bechtel, Achelpohl and Akers in their study of the amount of attention which people pay to television while they are "watching," however, that "movies received the greatest degree of attention while the set was on." "Correlates Between Observed Behavior and Questionnaire Responses on Television Viewing," in E. A. Rubinstein, G. A. Comstock and J. P. Murray, Television and Social Behavior, Vol. IV (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 299. This suggests that there is perhaps a more complex interaction between nature of viewing situation and nature of "stimulus" material than has usually been imagined.

⁷Christian Metz, "Notes Toward a Phenomenology of the Narrative," in Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 16-28.

⁸Ibid.

⁹The phenomenon of vicarious participation is obviously complex and not terribly well understood, nor has it been studied extensively. While the viewer enters the filmic space, he never completely confuses it with the actual physical space he occupies in "reality." The perhaps most attractive speculation about this phenomenon is offered by Nick Browne,

"The Spectator-in-the-Text: The Rhetoric of Stagecoach," Film Quarterly, Vol. XXIX, No. 2 (Winter, 1975-76), p. 36.

Evidently, a spectator is several places at once—with the fictional viewer, with the viewed, and at the same time in a position to evaluate and respond to the claims of each. This fact suggests that like the dreamer, the filmic spectator is a plural subject: in his reading he is and is not himself . . . The filmic image thus implies the ambiguity of a double origin—from both my literal place as spectator and from the place where the camera is within the imaginative space.

¹⁰John L. Fell, Film and the Narrative Tradition (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1974), p. xv.

¹¹Ibid., p. 14.

¹²Kari Hanet, "The Narrative Text of Shock Corridor," Screen, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Winter, 1974/75), pp. 18-28.

¹³Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," Screen, Vol. 16, No. 3 (Autumn, 1975), p. 17.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 13.

¹⁵Metz would claim that even the modern cinema which tends to call attention to itself as film has not "abandoned the narrative, [but rather] gives us narratives that are more diversified, more ramified, and more complex." Christian Metz, "The Modern Cinema and Narrativity," in Metz, op. cit., p. 227.

¹⁶Peter Dart, "The Concept of 'Identification' in Film Theory." Paper presented at the 30th Annual Conference of the University Film Association, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, August 16-20, 1976.

¹⁷"The question of just what characteristics of a screen character will produce fullest identification among viewers is a fascinating and still largely unexplored issue. The ability to lead viewers into identification with the character is a major part of the screenwriter's skill, and so far belongs more to the sphere of art than science." Eleanor E. Maccoby, "The Effects of the Mass Media," in Otto N. Larsen (ed.), Violence and the Mass Media (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 120.

¹⁸Cedric Clark, "Race, Identification, and Television Violence," in G. A. Comstock, E. A. Rubinstein and J. P. Murray (ed.), Television and Social Behaviour, Vol. V (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 120-184.

¹⁹Cecilia V. Feilitzen and Olga Linné, "Identifying with Television Characters," Journal of Communication, Vol. 25, No. 4 (Autumn, 1975), pp. 51-55.

²⁰Andrew Tudor, Image and Influence: Studies in the Sociology of Film (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974), pp. 76-85.

²¹Ibid., p. 80.

²²Ibid., p. 81.

²³Ibid., p. 83.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., p. 85.

²⁶Edward Branigan, "Formal Permutations of the Point-of-View Shot," Screen, Vol. 16, No. 3 (Autumn, 1975), p. 64.

²⁷Browne, op. cit., p. 34.

²⁸Franklin Fearing, "Influence of the Movies on Attitudes and Behaviour," in Denis McQuail (ed.), Sociology of Mass Communications (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), pp. 132-133. Originally published in Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, No. 254 (November, 1947), pp. 70-79.

²⁹Herbert J. Gans, "The Creator-Audience Relationship in the Mass Media: An Analysis of Movie-Making," in Bernard Rosenberg and David Manning White (ed.), Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America (New York: The Free Press, 1957), p. 315.

³⁰Joseph T. Klapper, The Effects of Mass Communication (New York: The Free Press, 1960) and J. D. Halloran, The Effects of Mass Communication, with Special Reference to Television (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1964).

³¹Herbert J. Gans, "The Relationship Between the Movies and the Public, and Some Implications for Movie Criticism and Movie-Making." Paper presented at the Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, February 18, 1960.

³²Tudor, Image and Influence, p. 86.

³³Jack Lyle and Heidi R. Hoffman, "Children's Use of Television and Other Media," in E. A. Rubinstein, G. A. Comstock and J. P. Murray (ed.), Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 4 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 152-153.

³⁴"Steady [television] viewing begins around age three and continues to stay at relatively high levels until age 12, when a gradual decline begins . . . The data suggest that the decline 'bottoms out' in one's early twenties and begins to rise again with the onset of marriage (especially for women). A noticeable jump in viewing (especially for men) also occurs

around age 50, when children depart from home and leave more time for their parents to devote to television. Viewing times seem to increase further after retirement, when available leisure time reaches a maximum." John P. Robinson, "Toward Defining the Functions of Television," in E. A. Rubinstein, G. A. Comstock and J. P. Murray (ed.), Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 4 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 572.

^{3 5}Tudor, Image and Influence, p. 87.

^{3 6}Herbert J. Gans, "The Creator-Audience Relationship in Mass Media: An Analysis of Movie Making," in Rosenberg and White, op. cit., p. 316. Gans observes in a note "that publics are further stratified by age, sex, socio-economic characteristics, education and taste level."

^{3 7}Herbert J. Gans, Popular Culture and High Culture: An Analysis and Evaluation of Taste (New York: Basic Books, 1974), p. 12. A taste public is an unorganized aggregate of users of a taste culture "who make similar choices of values and taste culture content."

^{3 8}Ibid., p. 70.

^{3 9}Ibid., p. 86.

^{4 0}Ibid., p. 90.

^{4 1}Ibid., p. 93.

^{4 2}Philip Anst, "Differential Movie Appeals as Correlates of Attendance," Journalism Quarterly, Vol. 44, No. 1 (Spring, 1967), pp. 86-90.

^{4 3}Ibid., p. 88.

^{4 4}Ibid., p. 90.

^{4 5}Gans, "The Relationship Between the Movies and the Public," p. 14.

^{4 6}Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, "Some themes in research on the effects of televised violence," in Symposium on Television Violence (Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1976), p. 103.

^{4 7}The Royal Commission on Violence in the Communications Industry, Interim Report, January, 1976, pp. III-10 to III-17.

^{4 8}"The accumulated experimental findings on the effects of media violence, including the relevant experimental investigations sponsored by this program, fail to support Feshbach's theory [of catharsis] and conclusions. . . . As matters now stand, the weight of the experimental evidence from the present series of studies, as well as from prior research, suggests that viewing filmed violence has an observable effect on some children in the direction of increasing their aggressive behavior. Many

of the findings, however, fail to show any statistically significant effects in either direction." Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior, Television and Growing Up: The Impact of Televised Violence (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 108, 109.

⁴⁹Richard E. Goranson, Television Violence Effects: Issues and Evidence. Research Report, The Royal Commission on Violence in the Communications Industry, 1976, p. 31.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 34.

⁵¹The most striking exceptions to this rule have been three naturalistic studies which have employed commercial films to demonstrate an increase in aggression. See Goranson, Ibid., p. 21.

⁵²Seymour Feshbach, "Reality and Fantasy in Filmed Violence," in J. P. Murray, E. A. Rubinstein and G. A. Comstock (ed.), Television and Social Behavior, Vol. II (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 340.

⁵³Gerhard J. Hanneman, "Message Uncertainty as a Predictor of Arousal and Aggression." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.

⁵⁴Feshbach, op. cit., p. 340.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 341.

⁵⁶It should be noted that the differences in violence ratings and incidence of violence for popular and not-so-popular films was smaller than for either the Canadian/non-Canadian or action/non-action comparisons.

⁵⁷The people occupying this taste public are described by Gans as "the older lower-middle class, but mainly . . . skilled and semiskilled factory and service workers, and . . . the semiskilled white collar workers [i.e.] the people who obtained nonacademic high school educations and often dropped out after the tenth grade." Gans, Popular Culture and High Culture, p. 89.

⁵⁸See Goranson, op. cit., pp. 25-30 and Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, op. cit., pp. 106-107.

⁵⁹The Royal Commission on Violence in the Communications Industry, op. cit., p. III-15.

⁶⁰John Renner, Violence, the Media and Mental Disorder. Research Report, The Royal Commission on Violence in the Communications Industry, 1976.

⁶¹Cartoons do elicit less aggression in children because of the lack of reality to them. See Goranson, op. cit., pp. 50-54.

⁶²One could speculate that bizarre and unusual behaviours and situations are consciously pursued in movies as a means of differentiating them from television, with its somewhat more restricted field of action. Subjects which are taboo on television make movies more "attractive" to the jaded television viewer and may motivate him to take the time, make the effort and spend the money to attend the movies.

⁶³Goranson, op. cit., p. 8.

⁶⁴CRTC, op. cit., p. 110.

⁶⁵See Goranson, op. cit., pp. 55-59.

⁶⁶Anthony N. Doob and Glenn E. Macdonald, The News Media and Perceptions of Violence. Research Report, The Royal Commission on Violence in the Communications Industry, 1976.

⁶⁷Renner, op. cit.

APPENDIX A
THE METHOD OF SELECTING THE SAMPLE

1. Delineation of the Population(s)

The first difficulty encountered in selecting the sample was defining the universe or population itself. The initial plan was to sample from among the films exhibited during the years 1972-75 with stratification according to popularity. We were interested in surveying recent films and originally thought such a time-frame might allow us to examine any trends that might emerge. On reflection, however, it became evident that our small sample size (25 films) would not permit meaningful generalizations to a universe of upwards of 1,000 films for that time period. As a consequence, we settled on drawing our sample from only those films exhibited in Ontario in 1975. (Discrepancies between year of production and year of exhibition are discussed below, as are other problems in defining the universe.) Such a time-frame also brought us closer to the samples of the other content studies, further facilitating comparisons among findings.

A central interest of The Royal Commission was a comparison of Canadian and non-Canadian (basically U.S.) media content. To achieve such a comparison it was necessary, in effect, to divide the universe of all films into two populations—Canadian and non-Canadian—and sample from both. A proportionate division of the total number of films to be analyzed between the two on the basis of number of films produced and exhibited

in 1975 would have generated only one Canadian film. (There were 427 non-Canadian and 14 Canadian films in 1975.) After the procedures taken to define and stratify the populations had been completed, it was decided that five of the 25 films of the sample would be selected from the Canadian population and the remaining 20 from the non-Canadian one. This disproportionate number of Canadian films was felt to be the minimum necessary to allow meaningful comparisons between Canadian and non-Canadian films.

The primary criterion for inclusion in the populations was that the film had been exhibited in Ontario in 1975. Unfortunately, short of canvassing every theatre and drive-in in the province, there was no means of securing such information. The closest approximation to this information was found to be the cards on films submitted for classification kept by the Theatres Branch of the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

There would be three basic problems with a list of films so obtained, however: first, the cards are compiled on a April-March fiscal year while the financial data to be used to stratify the sample(s) is reported for the calendar year; secondly, the list includes a large number of foreign films which seem destined for minority ethnic audiences (e.g. of the 858 features submitted in 1975-76, 229 alone were from China—i.e. Hong Kong or Taiwan—while 301 of the remainder were from countries whose native tongue is not English); and thirdly, just because the film is submitted and passed by the Theatres Branch, there is no guarantee that the film was subsequently exhibited—and there is also a good possibility

that a lag exists between the time a film is submitted and when it is exhibited—leaving films submitted near the end of the calendar year somewhat doubtful.

Since the Commission was concerned with films that were intended for a mass audience, the second problem was dealt with by further specifying the criteria for admission to the population to state that the film had to be available in an English-language version (either as original language or dubbed). The problem of the fiscal year record-keeping was rectified by the research staff of the Commission while preparing the list from the Theatre Branch's cards. The final problem of lack of perfect correspondence between submission and exhibition dates could not be compensated for within our resources, and had to be accepted as just that. It was assumed, however, that this was not a significant factor.

2. Stratifying and Weighting the Sample(s)

As mentioned above, there was a desire to stratify the populations by popularity. Such a stratification with proportionate sampling (i.e. sampling within a stratum according to that stratum's contribution to overall popularity) would give a better picture of the content to which large numbers of people were exposed—as Goodlad suggests¹—and there has also been evidence presented that violence is popular.²

It must be realized, however, that measures of the popularity of films are even more indirect than those of television programs (i.e. ratings). As Tudor points out, in the case of film "audience influence [i.e. preference] is mediated primarily through the images communicators hold,

and only finally through financial veto at the box office."³ Box office receipts then would be an indicator of popularity. Unfortunately, as was the case for information on film exhibitions, information on box office was not directly available. As with much economic data, it is treated with great secrecy. (In fact, many film producers would be interested in learning about the box office success of particular films.) Overall box office figures are available from the U.S. Department of Commerce and Statistics Canada as are estimates of same from Variety⁴ and the Motion Picture Association of America, but information on individual films (apart from blockbusters like Jaws) is scarce.

The best approximation of box office receipts for any sizable number of films is Variety's annual list of "Big Rental Films." As Variety explains it, the list reflects films' "domestic (United States and Canada) rentals accruing to the distributors (not total receipts taken in at all the theatres)."⁵ The list for 1975 contains 104 films each of which produced rental revenues of \$1,000,000 or more. The list includes some films which were produced before 1974 or 1975 and have been "reissued" and excludes some films which were released too late for information about them to be obtained. Variety explains this "too late in" rule of thumb as follows:

. . . some pictures go into release too late in the calendar year and cannot be computed for inclusion. Thus, certain of the October-December openings of 1975 were on the market too sketchily for significance here. They must wait for next year's compilation. . . .

There are some exceptions to the "too late in" rule of thumb, namely films that made such fast impact on the box office (usually the road-show type films (remember them?) or the ever-increasing mass showcase) that the minimum \$1,000,000 rentals is reached in a short period.

It will be noted that a number of late 1974 releases which were not included in our last Anniversary Edition compilation are picked up herewith.⁶

This list gave us what were to become our upper and middle strata of the non-Canadian population, and the list which the Royal Commission staff gleaned from the Theatres Branch's cards (minus the films that already appeared on the Variety list and the Canadian titles) gave us the lower stratum. The non-Canadian population was then divided into the top 15 (films which had rentals of close to \$10,000,000 or better), the mid 89 (the remainder of the Variety list) and the bottom 323 (the adjusted list from the Theatres Branch's cards). This gave a total of 427 films in the non-Canadian population.

The desire to sample proportionately created additional problems. While we had information on the 104 individual "Big Rental Films" from Variety, we did not have an overall revenue-from-rentals figure as exists for overall box office. Without such a figure, we had no idea what the revenue from the lower stratum would be, and of course, could not calculate the respective proportions of overall revenue generated by the three strata and thereby derive the sampling proportions. Some information was located, however, that allowed estimates to be arrived at (once certain assumptions had been made).

Information from Variety gave the share of the 1975 domestic film market for the various major distributors.⁷ Among those distributors was Buena Vista whose financial history had earlier been traced by Variety as well.⁸ The two sets of data were not completely compatible, however, in that the share-of-market data was based on "theatrical film rentals

of at least \$1,000,000 in that period," while the Buena Vista revenues were for theatrical rentals for all films in the same period—not just for \$1,000,000-plus films. In light of lack of evidence to the contrary, it seems justifiable to assume that the inclusion of rental revenues for the films earning less than \$1,000,000 would not significantly alter the share of the market for the major distributors. This assumption allowed the two sets of data to be used to calculate the overall rental revenue figure and the appropriate sampling proportions.

The sampling proportions and number of films from each stratum to be included in the sample were calculated in the following manner:

1975 Buena Vista Share of Market = 6.0%
(based on U.S.-Canada theatrical film rentals of \$1,000,000-plus)

1975 Total Disney-Buena Vista U.S.-Canada Theatrical Film Rentals = \$61.224 million

Assuming that share of market would not be significantly altered if all (not just \$1,000,000-plus) rentals were included,

6.0% of total rentals = \$61.224 million

Total Rentals = $\frac{61.224}{60} \times 100$ = \$1,020.4 million

Total Rentals for top 15 films = \$395.75 million

1) Sampling proportion = $\frac{395.75}{1020.4} \times 100 \approx 38.784\%$

Total rentals for mid 89 films = \$348.955 million

2) Sampling proportion = $\frac{348.955}{1020.4} \times 100 \approx 34.198\%$

Total rentals for bottom 323 films = 1020.4 - 744.705 = \$275.695 million

3) Sampling proportion = $\frac{275.695}{1020.4} \times 100 \approx 27.018\%$

For a sample of 20 films, then

Stratum One = $.38784 \times 20 = 7.7568 \approx 8$ films

Stratum Two = $.34198 \times 20 = 6.8396 \approx 7$ films

Stratum Three = $.270.018 \times 20 = 5.4036 \approx 5$ films

The Canadian films had to be approached somewhat differently. First of all there were significantly fewer of them: 14 as compared to 427 non-Canadian. In addition, there was almost as great a dearth of financial data about them as there was about the non-Canadian films. The Canadian Film Development Corporation (CFDC) was able to supply box office figures for nine of the 14 English-Canadian films of 1975. Given these factors and the somewhat conflicting desire to maintain a parallelism between the two samples, it was decided to divide the Canadian films into two strata and sample differentially. Stratum One included films that earned \$100,000 or more and Stratum Two included the four films that earned less than \$100,000 and five for which box office data was not available. Originally it was somewhat arbitrarily decided to select three films from Stratum One and two from Stratum Two. The unavailability of a total of three films from Stratum One, however, meant the Canadian sample consisted of two films from Stratum One and three from Stratum Two.

The requisite number of films for each stratum of each population was selected using a table of random numbers.⁹

3. Unavailability of Films

As the films were drawn and attempts were made to secure them for analysis, additional difficulties arose. Given the

fact that the equipment available to us was 16 mm., it was necessary to obtain 16 mm. prints of the films in order to study them. Unfortunately, however, the "logic" of film distribution is such that 16 mm. prints of many recent, as well as "exotic" films, were not available. As can be seen from Table A-1, then, the major reason for dropping films from the sample was their unavailability in 16 mm. The list of films ultimately included in the sample(s) (along with certain data about them) is given in Table A-2.

TABLE A-1

FILMS DROPPED FROM SAMPLE(S)*

	<u>Reason for Being Dropped</u>
<u>NON-CANADIAN</u>	
<u>Stratum One</u>	
The Apple Dumpling Gang Jaws	Not available during coding period Not available in 16 mm.
<u>Stratum Two</u>	
The Other Side of the Mountain	Not available in 16 mm.
The Exorcist	Withdrawn due to re-release
The Seventh Voyage of Sinbad	Produced before 1970
Return to Macon County	Not available in 16 mm.
The Erotic Advenutres of Zorro	Not available in 16 mm.
Dog Day Afternoon	Withdrawn due to re-release
White Lightning	Not available in 16 mm.
<u>Stratum Three</u>	
Ride Hard, Ride Wild	Not available in 16 mm.
Champagne	Produced before 1970
Frankenstein's Castle (House) of Freaks	Not available in 16 mm.
School Girl to Growing Up	Not available in 16 mm.
Mermaid	Not available in 16 mm.
We Do It	Not available in 16 mm.
Undercover Girls	Not available in 16 mm.
Ten Little Indians	Not available in 16 mm.
Very Natural Thing	Not available in 16 mm.
Summer School Teachers	Not available in 16 mm.
<u>CANADIAN</u>	
<u>Stratum One</u>	
Recommendation for Mercy	Not available in 16 mm.
Shivers	Not available in 16 mm.
It Seemed Like a Good Idea at the Time	Not available in 16 mm.
<u>Stratum Two</u>	
The Man Who Skied Down Mt. Everest	Not available in 16 mm.
Monkeys in the Attic	Not available in 16 mm.
Lions for Breakfast	Not available in 16 mm.

Jacques Brel is Alive and	Not available in 16 mm.
Well and Living in Paris	
Mystery of the Million	Not available in 16 mm.
Dollar Hockey Puck	

*Within strata, the films are listed in the order in which they were originally selected for inclusion in the sample.

TABLE A-2

FILMS INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE (S)

NON-CANADIANSTRATUM ONE (8 of top 15)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Censor Rating</u>	<u>Length (Min.)</u>	<u>Production Source</u>	<u>Distributor</u>
01	Murder on the Orient Express	General	128	U.S.A.	Paramount
02	Freebie and the Bean	Restricted	113	U.S.A.	Warner Bros.
03	Funny Lady	Adult	138	U.S.A.	Astral/Columbia
04	Godfather Part II	Adult	200	U.S.A.	Paramount
05	Shampoo	Restricted	109	U.S.A.	Astral/Columbia
06	The Towering Inferno	Adult	165	U.S.A.	Bellevue/Fox
07	The Return of the Pink Panther	Adult	113	Great Britain	United Artists
08	The Man with the Golden Gun	Adult	124	Great Britain	United Artists
<u>STRATUM TWO (7 of mid 89)</u>					
09	Three Days of the Condor	Restricted	118	U.S.A.	Paramount
10	Death Race 2000	Adult	78	U.S.A.	Cine/Art
11	Mahogany	Adult	109	U.S.A.	Paramount
12	French Connection II	Restricted	119	U.S.A.	Bellevue/Fox
13	The Odessa File	Adult	128	Great Brit. /Germany	Astral/Columbia
14	Once is Not Enough	Restricted	122	U.S.A.	Paramount
15	The Strongest Man in the World	General	92	U.S.A.	Bellevue

TABLE A-2 (continued)

STRATUM THREE (5 of bottom 323)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Censor Rating</u>	<u>Length (Min.)</u>	<u>Production Source</u>	<u>Distributor</u>
16	Doc Savage, The Man of Bronze	General	100	U.S.A.	Warner Bros.
17	The Nickel Ride	Adult	106	U.S.A.	Bellevue/Fox
18	Cleopatra Jones and the Casino of Gold	Restricted	96	U.S.A./ Hong Kong	Warner Bros.
19	Hearts and Minds	Restricted	112	U.S.A.	Warner Bros.
20	Killer Force	Restricted	100	Great Brit. U.S.A.	Ambassador

CANADIAN

STRATUM ONE(2 of top 5)

22	Lies My Father Told Me	Adult	104	Canada	Astral
23	Sunday in the Country	Restricted	91	Canada	Ambassador

STRATUM TWO (3 of remaining 9)

24	My Pleasure is My Business	Restricted	90	Canada	IFD
25	Sudden Fury	Adult	90	Canada	Ambassador
21	Wings in the Wilderness	General	90	Canada	Wildlife Film Distributors

APPENDIX A

ENDNOTES

¹J. S. R. Goodlad, The Sociology of Popular Drama (London: Heinemann, 1971).

²David G. Clark and William B. Blankenburg, "Trends in Violent Conflict in Selected Mass Media," in G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (ed.), Television and Social Behavior, Vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

³Andrew Tudor, Image and Influence: Studies in the Sociology of Film (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974), p. 227.

⁴A. D. Murphy, "1975 Record Film B.O. Near \$1.9 Bil," Variety (January 14, 1976), pp. 1, 86.

⁵"Big Rental Films of 1975," Variety (January 7, 1976), p. 18, 52.

⁶Ibid.

⁷A. D. Murphy, "Universal's Whale of Pix Biz Share," Variety (February 11, 1976), pp. 1, 34.

⁸A. D. Murphy, "Disney Decade Doubled World Rents," Variety (January 28, 1976), pp. 3, 27.

⁹D. Owen, Handbook of Statistical Tables (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1962).

APPENDIX B
THE METHODOLOGY OF CONTENT ANALYSIS
AS EMPLOYED IN THE STUDY

1. Development of the Recording (Coding) Instrument

The study examined the films for five distinct units of analysis: film, character, relationship, incident (of which there were eight distinct types) and individual shot (for violent conflict and irrational violence incidents). Each unit had its own separate recording sheet(s) and corresponding recording instructions. The incident unit was considerably more complex than the others, and the elements to be coded varied from incident type to incident type (Table B-1). At the suggestion of Ben Singer, the recording sheets and corresponding recording instructions were colour-coded to facilitate the work of the coders.

The instrument itself was adapted from the one developed by Tannis Williams and Merle Zabrack for the Commission's study of entertainment television. Their instrument had been derived in part from Gerbner's earlier studies¹ and in part from Eugene Tate's survey protocol for his study of adolescent and adult reactions to television (also undertaken for the Commission). The television instrument was discussed and further refined at meetings of the Commission's major content analysis investigators and research staff in May and July of 1976.² Modifications were made to the television instrument for our use on the basis of some pre-tests. Such modifications

TABLE B-1
ELEMENTS CODED FOR EACH TYPE OF INCIDENT

	CONFLICT			NON-CONFLICT				
	Violence	Argument	Non-Violent Non-Argument	Irrational Violence	Verbal Abuse	Harm to Self	Destruction of Property	Theft
General Incident	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Violence	x			x				
Argument (Verbal abuse)		x			x			
Non-Violent Non-Argument			x					
Harm to Self						x		
Destruction of Property							x	
Theft								x
Setting	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Means/Ends	x	x	x					
Method of Dealing with Conflict	x	x	x					
Technical/Stylistic Treatment	x			x				

were related mainly to the differences between the film and television formats (e.g. the category "title character" was found to be superfluous for "character status" in films since films are usually only "one-shot" affairs and are only rarely as character-centred as television shows are). In addition, the shot unit was unique to the film study, its variables and categorizations being drawn from a number of practical film-making texts³ and theoretical/critical works.⁴

2. Selection and Training of Coders

Two senior undergraduates were recruited as coders for this project. Both students had extensive backgrounds in media studies, as well as practical experience and theoretical instruction in filmmaking. A working knowledge of film-making was felt to be especially important for the coding of the technical/stylistic variables of the shots.

After the coders had had the codebook and procedures explained to them, and had been given an opportunity to study the codebook at some length, practice sessions involving the coding of actual films were begun. Initially, it was decided to utilize short films so that a greater variety of material could be covered in a shorter period of time. To this end, Vile in the Sunshine Crawling (a University of Windsor student production) was shown to and coded by the coders. It became clear rather quickly, however, that the film created a number of difficulties and was discarded as training material. Subsequent experiences with other short films of considerable merit (such as Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge) indicated that short films are generally not good substitutes for feature length films.

The contracted time frame seems to incline filmmakers toward more convoluted narratives (if indeed the film is a narrative at all) and more obvious symbolism than is evident in features. In addition, characters introduced in the films are usually not developed enough for many variables to be coded adequately.

Unfortunately, however, there were no prints of feature films available to us for the extended time period we required them. A compromise of sorts was realized when we obtained a recording off-air of Sam Peckinpah's The Wild Bunch. Even in its "edited-for-television" version, the film provided a wealth of material for practice and training purposes, but the video-tape format did create other difficulties. Using video-cassettes in a Sony U-matic machine meant that locating the exact beginning of individual shots was next to impossible, making the timing of incident durations imprecise. In addition, this lack of accurate cueing, combined with the inability to vary the rate of transport of the tape while an image was being produced (as is available in film with an Athena projector or horizontal editing table) made the coding of the technical/stylistic variables of the individual shots extremely difficult, if not virtually impossible. Nevertheless, the utilization of The Wild Bunch proved to be a relatively useful teaching/learning experience, and some refinements were made to the code-book on the basis of the coders, research assistant's and principal investigators' work on it. At this point, the coding of the films in the sample began. A number of meetings in the early stages of the study were used to discuss problems that arose and eliminate or reduce difficulties as they emerged.

After the first few films had been coded, it became

clear that the coding of the films was taking much longer than had been anticipated. For the first five films, coding time was averaging about 26 hours per film per coder, while the time originally estimated was only 15 hours. This increased time was mainly a result of the large amount of time consumed in coding incidents and the stylistic elements of the shots of violence incidents. Even reducing double coding to randomly selected units for the films and cutting back on the number of films coded for technical/stylistic variables (see "Determining Reliability" below for fuller details) it was obvious that two more coders had to be employed to complete the coding portion of the study within the established time-frame. Two coders (with qualifications similar to the previously hired coders) were employed and given an intensive ten-day orientation, using videotapes of Murder on the Orient Express and Godfather, Part II as training materials.

3. Analysis Procedures

The coding of each film involved two complete viewings and at least one further partial viewing. During the first viewing the coders watched simply as filmviewers rather than scientific observers. The concern here was to satisfy the coders' inevitable attraction to the film as a viewing experience so that such distraction would not intrude into subsequent coding activity. (It also increased the coders' familiarity with the film upon subsequent viewings.) During the second viewing, the coders listed all the characters in the order in which they first appeared in the film and made rough notes on the occurrence of the various types of incidents for reference

when they were coding incidents.

After the completion of the second viewing, the coders noted which characters required coding (i.e. which were leading characters and non-leading conflictants/violents) and identified and coded the relationships among the various characters who were to be coded. After these tasks were completed, they proceeded to code the films themselves (after which they were not to refer back to the "film" coding sheets). When the coding of the films was completed, the characters were coded as completely as possible with the allowance that the coders could return to complete any unfinished character profile after the third viewing.

The first two viewings had been normal, uninterrupted screenings. The third viewing (for the purpose of coding incidents), however, involved stopping the film after each incident (or perhaps even in mid-incident) and rerunning it as necessary so that a full and proper coding could be accomplished. The constant starting and stopping, and reversing and slowing down of the rate of action was only possible with the use of an Athena projector and a Steenbeck horizontal editing table. The use of these machines was also imperative for the detailed shot-by-shot stylistic analysis of the violence incidents, which normally followed the coding of the incidents proper.⁵ The coding of the incidents and stylistic treatment was terribly time-consuming, the extreme case of Death Race 2000 requiring 33 hours for that phase alone.

4. Determining Reliability

As Gerbner explains it,

The purpose of reliability measures in content analysis is to ascertain the degree to which the recorded data truly reflect the properties of the material being studied, and do not reflect the contamination of observer bias or of instrument ambiguity.⁶

In content analysis, this reliability is determined by comparing the judgments of at least two independent observers for the same materials. Agreement must be greater than chance so that it may be assumed that "the data truly reflect the phenomenon under observation." The establishment of reliability, then, required the double-coding of all the films (or some portion thereof) by at least two independent observers.

Perhaps this is the point at which some of the procedural difficulties surrounding the project should be described. The basic problem is that film prints are normally available for only very short time periods, especially recent popular films which are very much in demand. Unless one purchases the prints (if that is even possible), one is at the mercy of the booking schedules of the distributors. For this study, this brief period of film availability meant that the coders had to view the films together for the first two uninterrupted screenings, and since they could not be supervised continuously, some informal, contaminating communication could have occurred between them. Such arrangements also meant that a number of films had to be coded in various stages simultaneously, rather than each film being worked on from start to finish in turn, since one coder would have otherwise been left with nothing to do while another coder dealt with the incidents and the stylistic treatment of violence. Also as a consequence of such a situation, the coding assignments had to be mapped out well in advance, and each coder was aware of who was a data coder and who was a

reliability coder for a particular film, and consequently, aware of when agreement was being checked. This lack of uncertainty makes the reliability measures obtained less convincing than if they had been obtained under "blind" conditions.

The large amount of time required for coding each film, combined with the restricted time-frame of the study, necessitated another compromise. Rather than all aspects of all films being double coded, as had been the original intention, only certain portions of each film could be so coded (Table B-2). Originally, the determination of the pattern of codings was done randomly, but scheduling difficulties required that some alterations be made to the original assignments. The method of determination of the films to be coded for "style" of shots for violence incidents has already been described (see Chapter V, endnote 14).

The same set of agreement coefficients (as determined by Krippendorff's computer programme) were employed as in Gerbner's study.⁷ In addition, the same reliability criteria were established:

Those variables exhibiting coefficients of .80 or higher were accepted as unconditionally reliable. Variables between .67 and .80 were accepted as conditionally reliable, to be interpreted cautiously. Variables below .67 were considered unreliable and excluded from the analysis.⁸

TABLE B-2

CODING ASSIGNMENTS

	<u>Relationships</u>				<u>Characters</u>				<u>Film</u>				<u>Incidents</u>			
	Coder No.				Coder No.				Coder No.				Coder No.			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
The Nickel Ride*	a	b			a	b			a	b			a	b		
The Towering Inferno*	b	a			b	a			b	a			b	a		
Mahogany*	a				a				a	b			a	b		
Death Race 2000*	b	a			b	a			a					a		
Murder on the Orient Express*	b	a			b	a			a					a		
French Connection II*	a	b			a	b			a				a			
Godfather, Part II	a				a				a	b			a	b		
Funny Lady*	a	b			a	b			a				a			
Shampoo	b	a			b	a			a					a		
My Pleasure is My Business*	a				a				b	a			b	a		
Freebie and the Bean	a			b	a			b	a					a		
Sunday in the Country*	b		a		b		a				a				a	
Sudden Fury*			a				a			a		b		a		b

a = data coding

b = reliability coding

* = coded for technical/stylistic treatment of violence incidents

Table B-2 (continued)

	<u>Relationships</u>				<u>Characters</u>				<u>Film</u>				<u>Incidents</u>			
	Coder No.				Coder No.				Coder No.				Coder No.			
Killer Force	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
	a				a				a				a		b	
The Odessa File*		a		b		a		b		a				a		
Man With the Golden Gun		a		b		a		b		a				a		
Once is Not Enough	a				a				a		b		a		b	
The Strongest Man in the World		a				a				a		b		a		b
Wings in the Wilderness		a		b		a		b		a				a		
Cleopatra Jones and the Casino of Gold	a				a				a		b		a		b	
Lies My Father Told Me*		a				a				a		b		a		b
Doc Savage, Man of Bronze*	a				a				a				a		b	
Three Days of the Condor*		a				a				a		b		a		
Return of the Pink Panther	b		a			b		a								a
Hearts and Minds		a		b		a		b		a				a		

a = data coding

b = reliability coding

* = coded for technical/stylistic treatment of violence incidents

ENDNOTES

¹"Content Analysis Procedures and Results," in D. Lange, R. Ball and S. Ball (eds.), Violence and the Mass Media (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969), pp. 519-591 and "Violence in Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions," in G. A. Comstock and E. A. Rubinstein (eds.), Television and Social Behaviour, Vol. I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 28-188.

²Present at one or both of those meetings were Commission Research Director, C. K. Marchant, and research staff member, Barbara Leonard, and principal investigators Andre Caron, Don Gordon, Garth Jowett, Jim Linton, Ben Singer, Jim Taylor and Tannis Williams.

³Lee R. Bobker, Making Movies: from script to screen (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973); Barry Callaghan, Film-making (London: Thames and Hudson, 1973); Lenny Lipton, Independent Filmmaking (San Francisco: Straight Arrow Books, 1972); J. Kris Malkiewicz, Cinematography: A Guide for Film Makers and Film Teachers (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1973); John Mercer, An Introduction to Cinematography Second Edition (Champaign, Illinois: Stipes, 1974); Edward Pincus, Guide to Filmmaking (New York: Signet, 1969); Kenneth H. Roberts and Win Sharples, Jr., A Primer for Film-making: A Complete Guide to 16 mm and 35 mm Film Production (New York: Pegasus, 1971).

⁴Bela Balazs, Theory of the Film: Character and Growth of a New Art (New York: Dover, 1970); Lee R. Bobker, Elements of Film. Second Edition (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974); Lincoln F. Johnson, Film: Space, Time, Light and Sound (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974); Sigfried Kracauer, Theory of Film: Redemption of Physical Reality (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960); Karl Reisz and Gavin Millar, The Techniques of Film Editing (New York: Hastings House, 1968); James F. Scott, Film: The Medium and the Maker (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1975); Raymond Spottiswoode, A Grammar of the Film (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1969).

⁵In some cases the order of the procedures had to be altered since the non-leading conflictants/violents were defined by their participation in conflict or irrational violence incidents, and all these incidents might not be recognized until the viewing intended for the coding of incidents (i.e. the third time through the film). This meant that a full character list and set of relationships to be coded could not be realized until that point.

⁶Gerbner, "Violence in Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions," in Comstock and Rubinstein, op. cit., p. 168.

⁷Ibid., p. 169.

⁸Ibid.

